

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974

 NOVEMBER 19, 1973.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11459]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments, and presents herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House.....	\$2, 609, 090, 000
Amount of increase by Senate from the House.....	61, 882, 000
Total of bill as reported to Senate.....	2, 670, 972, 000
Amount of 1974 budget estimates.....	2, 944, 900, 000
Amount of 1973 appropriations.....	2, 323, 221, 000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Below the budget estimate, 1974.....	273, 928, 000
Above appropriations for fiscal year 1973.....	347, 751, 000

(1)

GENERAL STATEMENT

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Army, the Committee has approved an amount totaling \$567,735,000. This is an increase of \$16,160,000 from the amount of \$551,575,000 approved by the House, and a reduction of \$97,165,000 from the budget estimate of \$664,900,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Navy, the Committee has approved an amount totaling \$608,467,000. This is an increase of \$20,826,000 from the \$587,641,000 allowed by the House and a reduction of \$76,933,000 from the budget estimate of \$685,400,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Air Force, the Committee has approved an amount totaling \$261,198,000. This is an increase of \$21,496,000 over the \$239,702,000 allowed by the House and a reduction of \$30,702,000 from the budget estimate of \$291,900,000.

For the Army National Guard, the Committee approved \$35,200,000 and approval was given for the Army Reserve in the amount of \$40,700,000, the budget estimate.

For the Naval Reserve, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,300,000, which is the budget estimate.

For the Air Force Reserve, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,000,000.

For the Air National Guard, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,000,000.

For the Department of Defense agencies, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,000,000.¹ This is \$7,100,000 less than the budget estimate of \$19,100,000, and is \$12,000,000 above the House allowance.

The program breakdown is as follows:

Defense Nuclear Agency, \$574,000; National Security Agency, \$8,156,000; and the Defense Supply Agency, \$8,370,000. The committee also recommends for the Department of Defense general support programs a total of \$2,000,000 including planning and design.

¹ In addition, \$37,100,000 unobligated balances are available to finance the FY 1974 program.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

In this year's bill several areas have been stressed by the Services. Because the requirements of each service are unique, one Service may place more stress than the others on a particular facilities requirement. Areas investigated and reported on are: Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Construction Backlog, Family Housing, Medical Modernization, Pollution Abatement, Trident Facilities Program, Athens Homeporting, NATO Infrastructure, Shore Establishment Realignment, Modernization of Facilities, Planning and Design, Construction Management, and Access Roads.

In evaluating the FY 1974 Military Construction Program, the Committee was mindful of several recent, portentous events. On the negative side, the worst inflation in United States history continues. The effects of dollar devaluation abroad is being felt. The dramatic reductions in the numbers of men under arms and the major realignments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force bases create uncertainties. The Defense All-Volunteer Force concept has not yet proven itself. The military construction program approved by the Committee reflects these concerns.

BACHELOR HOUSING

ARMY

The Committee's concern with the lack of adequate housing for our service personnel is well known. It is to be noted that the Army is continuing its program of providing new and modernized bachelor housing on an accelerated basis.

The fiscal year 1974 program will provide for 23,425 new bachelor enlisted barracks spaces and 185 new bachelor officer spaces in the United States and overseas. Included in these are 3,935 enlisted and 100 officer spaces for the Woman's Army Corps, and 380 enlisted spaces programed for semi-permanent construction in isolated areas overseas. The Army has assured the Committee that in locating this new construction, emphasis has been placed on those troop stations which have the largest deficits in bachelor housing and which are included in the Army's long range planning. In addition to new construction, the budget contains a request for funds to modernize 45,188 enlisted barracks spaces and 528 officer spaces in order to bring these existing facilities up to present day standards. All officer spaces are in the United States and only 1,499 of the enlisted spaces are overseas. None of the overseas spaces are in Europe or Okinawa where alternative

methods of funding are available. The total dollar request for bachelor housing in fiscal year 1974 budget is \$371,278,000.

A review of the Army situation in bachelor housing reveals that the recent changes in criteria for new construction and modernization have had a great impact on the Army's existing permanent assets insofar as their classification into "adequate" or "substandard" is concerned. Almost none of the existing permanent barracks spaces meet accepted standards of adequacy with the exception of trainee barracks in the United States. Those now classified as not meeting current standards vary from pre-World War I buildings on some of the older posts, to relatively new barracks built in the 1960's. Based on long range strength projections, it is estimated that housing will be required for approximately 497,000 soldiers of whom 60,000 will be trainees. It will also be necessary to house an estimated 34,000 bachelor officers. Including construction and modernization already approved in fiscal year 1973 and earlier programs, the Army has approximately 397,000 permanent barracks spaces and 27,000 bachelor officer spaces worldwide. Approximately 40 percent of these existing assets are classified as substandard under current standards. Comparing the assets and requirements reveals a deficit of approximately 100,000 barracks spaces and 7,000 bachelor officer quarters spaces which can only be met by new construction. Additionally, over 158,000 spaces that are below standards require modernization.

In consonance with the new criteria for barracks the Army has developed an entirely new building design with emphasis on privacy for the individual. A review of this design reveals that it provides flexibility to assign, as personnel loads dictate, three E2-E4's, two E5-E6's or one E7-E9 to a 270 square foot room with bath. It also provides for privacy within the room, a small lounge to serve four to eight rooms, other space as required for storage, lobby, laundry, vending machines and mail boxes and separate buildings for unit administration and supply. The Committee endorses this new design and believes the Army should make every effort to continue to place emphasis on the bachelor housing program until all servicemen are provided adequate housing.

NAVY

The major deficiency in Navy bachelor housing is for enlisted personnel. The Navy has a post fiscal year 1974 deficit of 124,525 adequate bachelor enlisted spaces. Department of Defense officials declare that approximately \$612 million will be required to correct this deficiency. A percentage breakdown of this shortage by ratings shows the following:

	Percent
E-2 through E-4	78.2
E-5 through E-6	16.9
E-7 through E-9	4.9

The Navy states that it has applied a substantial portion of its military construction programs of the last three years to correcting this situation, as illustrated by the above quoted figures. The Navy states that in the next few years it expects to continue funding bachelor housing construction at approximately the \$60 million level. The Committee supports this effort and will monitor closely the bachelor housing program in the continuing years.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force is continuing its program to upgrade and modernize bachelor housing. The Air Force has a deficit of 8,000 spaces in officer quarters and 37,000 spaces in enlisted quarters. In addition, 18,000 officer and 167,000 enlisted spaces require upgrading/modernization. In fiscal year 1973, funds were provided to build 220 officer and 6484 enlisted spaces and to upgrade 180 officer and 8996 enlisted spaces. The current bill provides for 60 officer and 4768 enlisted new spaces and modernization of 4757 enlisted spaces. At the current rate of upgrading the Air Force inventory, adequate housing for all airmen will not be realized in the near future. The Air Force should continue and expand its efforts toward this goal.

The \$38 million requested in this year's program approximates recent years' Military Construction Program efforts; however, the emphasis is shifting from new construction to upgrading/modernization of the existing inventory. The deficiency in new spaces will require approximately \$323 million and modernization of the current inventory an additional \$581 million. The Air Force Construction Program primarily provides on-base housing for E-4's and below; all personnel at isolated locations; and at other locations where requirements are generated by student or transient personnel. They plan some new construction for E-5's and above when the local community cannot provide adequate housing. Modernization/upgrading of existing buildings for E-5's and above is being programmed on a selected basis.

Air Force continues to emphasize privacy in their new construction and modernization efforts since a recent survey on bachelor housing indicates airmen still place this item at the top of the list of desired amenities. The Air Force feels that a maximum of two persons per room is an economically acceptable substitute for their ultimate goal in privacy of a room for each airman. The Air Force is different in their objectives from the other Services, who prefer three and four-man rooms; however, their force is comprised mostly of highly trained technicians who work as individuals rather than in units. They are not providing more living space per occupant than the other Services—merely more privacy. Their construction program pursues their objective within Congressional statutory authorization limits by reducing space in lounges and other common use areas. The committee supports the Air Force program.

HOSPITAL PROGRAMS

ARMY

The Army program for fiscal year 1974 represents a moderate increase of approximately \$5 million over last year's request.

The fiscal year 1974 Military Construction, Army program includes \$39,609,000 for medical facilities to provide for one new hospital, one hospital addition, three dental clinics and one medical/dental clinic. Also included are parking facilities in support of the new hospital under construction at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. The single new hospital included is a replacement for the outmoded and inadequate plant at the United States Military Academy which has been

constructed piecemeal since 1890. The single hospital addition is for the purpose of expanding outpatient facilities at the hospital concerned. That project reflects the continued trend in the military health care system toward increasing demand for outpatient medical care. That demand is partially due to changes in concepts of health care delivery. Whereas in the civilian sector the increased demand for health care is noted across the spectrum of health related businesses, institutions and offices of private practitioners, nearly all aspects of the military health care delivery system are physically located within the hospital. Thus, changes in concepts of delivery of health care as well as in the amount of care demanded by the patient manifest themselves in the military system, to a great extent, as increased hospital outpatient requirements.

Included within this program are two prototype dental clinics. The clinics are designed on a modular concept which permits ready site adaptation to accommodate the number of dental treatment rooms required as well as certain types of supporting facilities. These clinics are designed to take maximum advantage of available professional dental resources through more efficient utilization, allowing each dentist to treat or supervise care for patients in as many as four chairs.

The first major increment of the Army's accelerated health facilities modernization program will be initiated with next year's military construction program, to include an extensive series of electrical/mechanical upgrade projects to bring existing permanent hospitals up to current fire, electrical, safety and accreditation standards, as well as major additions, improvements and replacement facilities.

The West Point Expansion Program has been underway for several years and the fiscal year 1974 budget request continues to implement that program. Three projects are contained in this year's increment; modernization of barracks, utilities expansion, and a new hospital. The key project is the proposed new hospital.

The requirement for a new hospital is derived from two considerations:

- a. First, the present hospital is outmoded and inadequate. It was built incrementally and modified over a period of years, it is inadequate for servicing supported strengths, and is located in a highly congested and noisy area with extremely limited access other than on foot. This condition limits its usefulness to a significant portion of the population served.

- b. The second consideration is that the present hospital structure is urgently required to meet other USMA expansion requirements.

- c. The relocation of the hospital was the second priority project in the overall Expansion Plan. The project was originally authorized by Congress in FY 1966, however, due to several circumstances new Congressional authorization is required. The planned relocation of the hospital has significantly affected other planning. Other construction to date, including roads, parking, utilities, academic building, has been based on the assumption that the hospital would be relocated.

Since a new hospital was planned the existing structure has received little more than breakdown maintenance since 1965, as noted above. Building systems requiring the expenditure of substantial funds, if the structure is continued in use as a hospital for any extended period, include: the high pressure steam system, electrical

service and branch wiring, both hot and cold water systems; the central dictation, nurses call, personnel paging and telephone systems require replacement; three building elevators require replacement; existing piecemeal air-conditioning requires major expansion and rehabilitation.

Overall, the actual building configuration is a limiting factor in accommodating the increasing staff, treating an increased number of patients, and providing the medical services that are required.

Hospital equipment replacement in the existing structure has been kept to a minimum since it was anticipated that a new hospital would be constructed. Failure to provide a new facility in the near future would require a major expenditure for new equipment for which procurement was deferred during the past seven years. It is doubtful that the type and amount of equipment could be properly accommodated in the existing building.

The estimated cost of the hospital is \$25 million, a point that has raised considerable question. Improvements in the state of the art of medical care facilities in the past two years have resulted in increases in costs because of upgraded standards for electrical, mechanical, environmental, and fire protection systems which have been incorporated in the West Point design. For example, new standards adopted by the Veterans Administration; HEW, and the American Society of Heating, Ventilation and Refrigeration Engineers have brought about better, but more expensive systems for temperature and humidity control, air conditioning and filtration. Also, new NFPA fire codes have required such things as higher fire ratings for walls and doorways along the major paths of egress from the building. In addition, recent developments in diagnostic and therapeutic equipment, as well as new codes and standards, have placed greater demands on the quantity and reliability of electrical service, its flexibility, and the number of service terminals required.

Historically, construction costs at West Point have been very expensive. Several prime and subcontractors who have recently bid on projects at West Point were contacted informally and questioned with regard to the magnitude of risk and contingency factors that they had applied to their bids. From the responses given, it is concluded that contractors add a factor of 50% to all labor costs at West Point as compared to similar projects in other areas.

An alternative to a new hospital would be to renovate and modernize the existing facility. This alternative has been investigated and the results further support constructing a new facility. The estimated space requirements under modern criteria are just over 157,000 square feet. The present hospital can only provide just over 93,000 gross square feet of usable space. An ancillary clinic building would also be required to provide the remaining area. Engineering estimates for renovating the existing structure and providing an additional clinic building are approximately \$21 million. Also, facilities, estimated to cost approximately \$3.6 million, would be required to house those activities which are now programmed to move into the old hospital building upon completion of a new hospital. Further significant considerations are the serious degradation of medical service during the renovation (apt to extend over several years) and the fact that the resulting facility would still be located in a very congested area with very limited access to the users.

The Committee approved \$20,000,000 for the hospital.

The condition of Army medical facilities in overseas areas, particularly Europe, has been a matter of concern for some years. The majority of medical facilities now being used by the Army in Europe were not designed and constructed in a manner which lends itself to the needs of the modern health care delivery system. Existing designs result in inefficient use of personnel at a time when professional medical resources within the Army are declining in quantity. Many years of austere funding for maintenance and repair has resulted in physical plants which are marginal and in some cases shabby.

Projects in Europe programed over the next five years to effect minimal correction of current conditions include one new medical-dental clinic, one medical clinic addition, one dental clinic, one new optical laboratory and major alterations, improvements or renovations to seven hospitals. It is the opinion of the Committee that the Army and the Department of Defense should start negotiations with the host government in overseas areas, particularly Germany for repair of hospitals. In Germany, these hospitals are owned by the German government. This Committee will not look with favor upon U.S. Government funds being used to repair hospitals in Germany.

NAVY

The Secretary of Defense has recognized a serious need to upgrade facilities to assure the effective delivery of a high level of health care and has approved a program for modernizing military medical facilities.

The goal of the medical modernization program is to replace or upgrade all health care facilities to comparable civilian standards by the mid-1980's in order to continue to provide military personnel and their dependents a high level of health care and to attract and retain professional medical personnel by providing them with new/modern facilities in which to work.

The medical modernization program approved by the Secretary of Defense provided new funding levels to accelerate the replacement and modernization of obsolete hospitals, dispensaries and dental clinics and to upgrade some relatively new facilities to meet recently changed standards of the National Fire Protection Association, the Joint Committee on Accreditation of hospitals, Department of Defense planning and construction criteria and other nationally recognized organizations and codes. The Committee strongly endorses the objectives of this program.

The Navy's FY 1974 program requested a significant increase for medical facility construction over the program appropriated last year and is the first increment of the medical modernization program's five year plan.

The following table compares the FY 1974 medical program with the FY 1972 and FY 1973 programs:

Fiscal year :	
1974-----	\$37, 998, 000
1973-----	44, 384, 000
1972-----	27, 366, 000

At the time of development of the five year medical modernization program (spring 1972), Navy deficiencies amount to 684 million dollars (construction costs only based on FY 1974 dollars). Because of

program adjustments at various levels of review, the continually aging and obsolescence of our present plant, and more recent cost estimates, it will be necessary to extend the medical modernization program into FY 1979, or later, depending upon appropriations obtained. For FY 1975 through 1979, the medical modernization program is expected to cost between \$100 and \$150 million.

AIR FORCE

The Committee notes that the Air Force has proposed projects which will continue to strengthen the Air Force Hospital Concept and its emphasis on a comprehensive health care delivery system within a regionalized framework.

The Air Force Hospital System is an organized health care system within the continental United States based upon the concept of regionalized medical care with facilities of different sizes and capabilities in specific geographic subdivisions. The United States is divided into areas, each served by an Area Medical Center. Each area is further subdivided into regions, each served by a Regional Hospital. The number of regions within each area is determined by the eligible Department of Defense beneficiary population to be served and the capabilities of existing Air Force facilities.

Air Force hospitals constructed up through the mid-1960s generally allocated greater space to the inpatient area than to the outpatient activity. However, during the 1960s, there was a national shift to increased emphasis on outpatient care, and hospitals constructed before this change have proven to be functionally inadequate. The Air Force, at the direction of the Department of Defense, has identified those facilities which require modernization or replacement through the Military Construction Program.

Projects of this type have been supported by this Committee in the recent fiscal year programs. Among those medical facilities recently enlarged and modernized were these: fiscal year 65—Homestead Air Force Base, Florida; fiscal year 66—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; fiscal year 68—Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi; fiscal year 69—Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas; fiscal year 70—Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas; fiscal year 71—Langley Air Force Base, Virginia; fiscal year 72—Hill Air Force Base, Utah; and fiscal year 73—Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

The fiscal year 74 Military Construction Program contains 12 health facility projects. Three of these projects involve total replacement of the aged, professionally obsolete composite medical facilities at F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming; Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas; RAF Upper Heyford, England; which have been in use for 86 years, 18 years, and 49 years, respectively. The other three composite medical facilities in the program at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama; Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri; and Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma; involve additions and alterations principally addressing the problem of inadequate space for outpatients in the clinics, the pharmacy, the laboratory, the X-ray department, and the other areas serving these patients.

The Committee also recognizes the gross deficiencies to be rectified by the replacement of the functionally obsolete dental clinics at Barks-

dale Air Force Base, Louisiana, and Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, and the addition/alteration project involving the dental clinic at Keesler Air Force Base, Louisiana.

To permit the vacating of temporary facilities, the committee notes the proposed construction of vital aeromedical staging facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, and Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. Finally, the alteration of an existing dining hall on the Medina officer training base at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, will provide a small dispensary for the officer candidate trainees.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

ARMY

The Army has again proposed a significant program for Community Facilities as an important segment of an overall soldier oriented budget. Their program for \$34.4 million approximates the \$45.6 million approved in last year's appropriation and presents a well-balanced mix of facilities. This Committee is aware of the need for providing adequate facilities for welfare, recreation and leisure time activities for the soldier and his dependents. Many activities must still function in temporary World War II or permanent pre-World War II structures that are no longer adequate.

This year's Army program includes commissaries, a chapel center, a gymnasium, a confinement facility, a post office, service clubs, and dependent schools overseas. The requirement for this mix of community facilities in the Army is directly related to the corresponding service provided in the civilian community. The remoteness and large population of many Army installations generally preclude use of civilian community facilities.

AIR FORCE

The fiscal year 1974 Air Force request for Community Facilities totals \$24.5 million after authorization actions. This is a decrease of \$31.8 million from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1973. Community facilities includes: Gymnasiums, Libraries, Chapels, Commissaries, and Enlisted and Officer Open Messes. The Air Force feels that these and similar Morale and Recreation facilities are essential to the maintenance of a quality force. The Committee supports this position and feels that the Air Force current achievement of their all Volunteer objectives is directly related to these efforts to provide adequate community support facilities for its people.

MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

ARMY

This year's Army military construction bill contains five projects, totaling \$16.4 million, for maintenance facilities and represents a balance between depot and organizational level maintenance facility needs. Two of the projects are for aviation maintenance activities. This dollar total closely approximates the \$15.9 million for maintenance facilities approved by this Committee in fiscal year 1973.

The Army continues to have a very sizable backlog of maintenance facility requirements, estimated at over \$850 million, needed to replace World War II temporary type structures and reduce outright shortages at many installations. After an intensive study, many facility deficiencies have been specifically identified across the full range of maintenance responsibilities and scheduled into upcoming Army construction programs. It is anticipated the Army FY 1975 efforts toward providing adequate maintenance facilities will be at a level at least double that of fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The Committee expects the Army to remedy this facility shortage—an area that has been one of the Army's most significant problems in equipment readiness.

NAVY

Naval Shipyards and Naval Air Rework Facilities are industrial complexes essential for Fleet logistic support. The objectives of the Shipyard and Naval Air Rework Facilities modernization programs are to reduce operating costs, improve the efficiency of industrial operations, attain balanced capacity based on projected need for workload and mission assignments, and provide new capabilities required to support new weapon systems and changing technologies of the Fleet.

The long range Shipyard Modernization Program is a capital investment program to upgrade and modernize the Naval shipyards and improve yard surge capacity to react to limited or general war situations. Fleet readiness will be significantly improved through increased yard responsiveness both to Fleet regular overhaul and emergency repair requirements. The program incorporates the long range development of management techniques required to exploit scientific advances and increased productivity. It was initially conceived as a 10 year program with the first full increment approved by Congress in FY 1970. However, levels of funding required for accomplishment within the 10 year timeframe were not obtained for fiscal years 1970 through 1974 and Shipyard Modernization has been significantly delayed.

A very significant step was taken by the Navy this year with regard to its shipyard posture. On 17 April 1973 it was announced that both the Boston and Hunters Point Naval Shipyards would be closed. By eliminating this excess industrial capacity from the inventory and consolidating workload in other yards located near Fleet concentrations, the Navy's backlog of modernization work was reduced by some \$320 million.

Notable achievements toward modernization of the Naval shipyards have already been realized through the Shipyard Modernization Program. However, continuing changes in Fleet size and composition, the recent Shore Establishment Realignment actions directly and indirectly affecting naval shipyards, and the austere outlook for future facilities budgets dictate the need to update or restructure the modernization program to reflect these conditions in terms of valid long range facility and equipment requirements. Accordingly, in mid fiscal year 1974, the Naval Ship System Command has scheduled to commence a restructuring of the original Kaiser Engineer firm Shipyard Modernization Study for all shipyards with exception of Boston and Hunters Point which are scheduled for closure and Portsmouth, N.H.,

which was not included in the original study (a modernization study for Portsmouth, N.H., was completed in April, 1972). Following completion of this restructuring the proposed capital investment program for the modernization of Naval shipyards will be appropriately revised.

The program to modernize the facilities and equipment at the Navy's Naval Air Rework Facilities commenced in FY 1969. Prior to this very little improvements to these plants had been made since World War II. For example, from FY 1960 through 1968, an average of only \$2.35M was appropriated annually for construction at all the facilities. These amounts were clearly insufficient to keep World War II vintage plants capable of meeting today's increased and more complex work load. Obsolete buildings and equipment contributed to increases in aircraft in-process time, higher rework costs and failure to meet Fleet work load requirements. Longer rework time resulted in fewer operating aircraft available to the Fleet. Studies conducted on rework programs for three first line fighter and attack aircraft during 1967 and 1968 showed that investments in new buildings and equipments would result in substantial reductions in aircraft rework time, slow the rapid escalation in customer costs to a more normal level, and improve rework efficiency. The modernization program is the result of an extension of this evaluation to all aircraft models at all rework activities.

Future rework level is expected to show only minimal reductions. Even though the Navy's aircraft inventory and flying hours will decline, this will be offset by increased man-hours required to rework the more complex aircraft now in operation and being developed.

Consolidation of the rework facility resources was carried out with the April 1973 announcement of the closure of Naval Air Rework Facility Quonset Point. The remaining six rework facilities can absorb the Quonset Point workload with improvement in the overall utilization rate. The trend towards concentrating Navy-wide capability at individual rework facilities will be furthered by this action. The funding provided for modernization in recent programs is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	1971	1972	1973	1974
Naval air rework facilities.....	\$10.9	\$6.2	\$17.7	¹ \$11.4
Shipyard modernization.....	28.9	12.7	13.9	¹ 18.4

¹ Budget request.

The Navy has not been able to program at the originally conceived correction rate of ten years for the Naval Air Rework Facility Modernization Program or the Shipyard Modernization Program in recent years because of overall Military Construction budget constraints, the need to program personnel support, pollution abatement and other urgent programs.

AIR FORCE

Air Force Depot Plant Modernization Program progress and requests were reviewed in detail by the committee. Appropriations to

date, the 1974 construction request, and remaining requirements are displayed below:

[In millions of dollars]

Air Force base	MCP fiscal year					Equipment total	Program total
	1972	1973	1974	To go	Total		
Hill.....	14.1	0	8.3	20.6	43	18	61
Kelly.....	11.0	3.8	5.5	25.7	46	35	81
McClellan.....	0	9.2	2.5	27.3	39	26	65
Newark.....	1.5	0	0	2.5	4	4	8
Robins.....	15.8	7.2	4.3	15.7	43	15	58
Tinker.....	12.8	9.7	10.8	41.7	75	42	117
Total.....	55.2	29.9	31.4	133.5	250	140	390

The Committee notes that the Air Force is aggressively improving force effectiveness and reducing costs through this logistics depot modernization program. Improved force effectiveness is obtained by increasing logistics responsiveness through the provision of modern facilities and equipment for maintenance, supply and transportation activities in the logistics depots. With these new improvements, repair times are reduced, worker productivity enhanced and the quality and reliability of the weapon systems maintained increased. In the process, the depots are acquiring the technological capability to support the new, more sophisticated systems needed to meet today's threat. The demand for efforts, such as this, is even greater today than when the program was started two years ago.

The objective is to maintain a depot logistics plant that can rapidly, effectively and efficiently meet the needs of the deterrent forces or provide a base for mobilization, if needed, in a national emergency. Maintenance manpower is being reduced as programmed increases in productivity occur so that total organic depot production will not increase. In fiscal year 1973, this reduction amounted to 761 depot maintenance personnel spaces; in fiscal year 1974, there will be 464 more reductions; and by fiscal year 1978, if the program remains on schedule, an accumulated equivalent of 3,360 depot maintenance manpower spaces will be reduced. Old buildings and equipment are being disposed of as their replacements become available. By 1978, the total space occupied by depot maintenance and supply activities will be less than it is today. As a result, the cost of maintaining these deteriorated facilities will be eliminated and depot maintenance capacity will not increase. An auditing system has been established to ensure that the above occurs and that maximum benefits are indeed achieved.

The Air Force is just beginning to realize benefits from the fiscal year 1971 MCP Depot Plant Modernization Program forerunners. Kelly AFB began to use the largest of these, a \$15.7 million Depot Engine Overhaul Facility, in March and will start receiving full benefits by October 1973. This facility will operate with 200 fewer personnel than required to accomplish the same programmed workload in the WW I shops and old warehouses formerly used. Reduced engine procurement, made possible by repair time reductions achievable in this facility, amounts to over \$14 million. Because of these benefits, the investment cost will be amortized after approximately one year of operation.

BASE CLOSURES

ARMY .

In January 1973 the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff announced a series of major management actions designed to modernize, reorient and streamline the Army's organization within the Continental United States. In April 1973 the Secretary of Defense announced a number of facilities realignment actions to scale down the Department of Defense base structure commensurate with reduced force levels and training requirements.

The reorganization of the Army is designed to improve readiness, training, the materiel and equipment acquisition process, the quality and responsiveness of management and better support for the soldier in an era of constrained personnel and budget resources. Although improved efficiency is the main purpose of the Army reorganization, these management actions will also result in reduced operating costs and manpower savings. The reorganization will be essentially completed by 31 December 1973.

The detailed planning process which resulted in the reorganization was coordinated closely with the Army's concurrent planning for base realignments announced by the Secretary of Defense on 17 April. The Army's base realignment plan includes consolidation of service school activities, closure of one general hospital, reduction of depot activities, and closure of bases for which a need no longer exists.

These two actions are being carried out within the budget constraints of FY 73/74 and when fully realized, total annual savings from these two actions were originally estimated at approximately \$248 million, with over 21,000 manpower spaces eliminated.

As a result of this reorganization and realignment 524 excess family housing assets were generated at four Army bases. Final disposition of the units at Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, (506 units), Valley Forge General Hospital, Pennsylvania (2 units), and Fort Wolters, Texas (5 units) has not been determined. Eleven units at Charleston Army Depot, South Carolina will be transferred to Navy control. At Hamilton Air Force Base, California, the family housing assets will be transferred from the Air Force to Navy control and will be operated for use by all Services. About 200 units are occupied by Army personnel.

NAVY

The program reviewed by the Committee included 25 projects totaling \$45,918,000 which are needed to implement the Navy's planned Shore Establishment Realignment as announced by the Secretary of Defense on 17 April 1973. The Navy has indicated that, in addition, approximately \$46 million dollars will be required in next year's program to support the realignment. Since the time of submission of the FY 1974 program, the Navy has been able to reduce its FY 1974 requirement to \$45,199,000. According to present Navy estimates the realignment will permit cancellation of approximately 12 prior year construction projects totaling \$23 million and will result in annual savings of over \$200 million. The one time closure costs associated with the realignment are \$277 million including the estimated FY 1974 and FY 1975 military construction costs of \$91 million.

In addition to the annual savings, the Navy stated that future military construction requirements in the amount of \$197 million will no longer be required at the installations closed or with reduced operations. However, these costs *are not* included in the estimated \$200 million annual savings.

The Navy stated that any delay in the Shore Establishment Realignment will result in deferral of the above mentioned savings.

A break-down of the realignment by categories of activities follows:

Shipyards.—Two shipyards will be closed, the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California and the Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts.

Air stations.—Four will be closed and two will have operations reduced. The Naval Air Stations to be closed are Quonset Point, Rhode Island; Albany, Georgia; Glynco, Georgia; and Imperial Beach, California.

At the Naval Air Station, Alameda, activities will be realigned and activities at the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey will be significantly reduced.

Naval air rework facilities.—One will be closed at Quonset Point, Rhode Island.

Naval hospitals.—Three hospitals will be closed at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, St. Albans, New York and Chelsea, Massachusetts.

Training centers.—The Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland will be closed.

Naval complexes.—The greater portion of the Naval Complex at Boston will be phased out by reduction and disestablishment of activities.

A large portion of the complex at Newport and Quonset Point, Rhode Island will be phased out by the realignment or reduction of activities.

The Naval Station Complex, Key West will be disestablished. Significant reductions and realignment of activities will take place at the Naval Complex, New York City.

In Philadelphia, the Naval Air Engineering Center will be disestablished. The Marine Corps Supply Center will be closed and essential functions relocated to other Marine Corps Supply Facilities.

Family housing.—As a result of the Shore Establishment Realignment a total of 2,200 adequate and 1,064 substandard family housing units will be excessed from the Navy inventory. The Navy will acquire 2,170 adequate family housing units from force realignments of other Services which will help to alleviate the housing situation at these locations.

AIR FORCE

In April 1973, the Air Force announced major closure and realignment actions at six bases. As a result of this action, there will be ultimate savings of \$91 million in Air Force future expenditures (see chart below). The actions were made possible by: (1) the reduction of older model B-52 bombers at Westover AFB, Mass., and McCoy AFB, Fla.; (2) the consolidation of C-130 tactical airlift aircraft from Forbes AFB, Kansas, with other airlift units which were in a more favorable location to operationally support Army airlift requirements; (3) the reduction in overall pilot training requirements which permitted termination of training at Laredo AFB, Texas; (4) the

consolidation and relocation of smaller missions from Hamilton AFB, Calif., and Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico to other major installations.

ULTIMATE SAVINGS

(In thousands)

	Military personnel	O. & M., AF	O. & M., ANG	O. & M., AFR	Total, AF	MFH	Total
Forbes AFB.....	-10, 168	-\$5, 521	+\$6, 759	-----	-\$8, 930	-\$309	-\$9, 239
Hamilton AFB.....	-8, 330	-10, 647	-----	+\$6, 360	-12, 617	-1, 374	-13, 991
Laredo AFB.....	-11, 485	-4, 896	-----	-----	-16, 381	-427	-16, 808
McCoy AFB.....	-8, 839	-6, 763	-----	-----	-15, 602	-729	-16, 331
Ramey AFB.....	-11, 104	-8, 923	-----	-----	-20, 027	-1, 115	-21, 142
Westover AFB.....	-11, 008	-9, 199	-----	+7, 367	-12, 840	-687	-13, 527
Total.....	-60, 934	-45, 949	+6, 759	+13, 727	-86, 397	-4, 641	-91, 038

With respect to Military Family Housing at closed Air Force bases, the Air Force has, since 1966, entered into seven revenue producing no-cost protection and maintenance (P&M) revenue producing contracts with local governmental agencies, housing authorities, or other non-profit entities to provide care and custody and rental service with reduced and/or no requirement for appropriated funds. The contracts covered 3,585 Capehart, 1,601 Wherry, 505 appropriated fund, and 150 Lanham Act (inadequate) family housing units. Through 31 August 1973, \$4,108,176.91 over and above operational expenses have been collected in rentals of which \$3,875,924.30 have been returned to the Department of Defense Family Housing Management account. The balance currently being held in an Air Force suspense account will be transferred to the Department of Defense Family Housing Management account in the near future.

Since 1962, in excess of \$27,000,000 in proceeds resulting from the sale of houses on closed bases has been returned to the Department of Defense Family Housing Management account.

CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG

ARMY

The Army estimates its construction backlog at approximately \$7 billion, of which \$4 billion is for replacement and modernization. SAFEGUARD, NATO Infrastructure and overseas construction requirements are excluded from these totals. The Army is striving to hold this estimated backlog to manageable proportions by including only hard requirements and purging less essential items that realistically would probably never be built. With an estimated backlog of this magnitude it is difficult to register any significant annual reduction in the overall total. Newly identified requirements added to the program and rapidly increasing construction costs combine to nearly offset annual construction efforts. The Army's program is focusing on projects enhancing the soldiers' living conditions and well being. Specific programs have been outlined which will essentially eliminate deficits in bachelor housing and medical facilities by the end of this decade. Unfortunately, the backlogs in other construction categories are not expected to be reduced significantly within current funding levels.

NAVY

The Navy has advised the Committee that it has a backlog of essential Military Construction projects of almost \$7.7 billion. This is broken down between new missions, current missions, and replacement and modernization as follows:

BREAKDOWN BY TYPE

	Amount	Percent of total
New mission.....	\$2.4	31.2
Current mission.....	2.2	28.6
Replacement and modernization.....	3.1	40.2
Total deficiencies.....	7.7	100.0

The Navy estimates that the annual funding needed to correct these deficiencies is \$800 million. The following table shows the funding received, the trend toward achieving the annual funding goal, and the rate at which the Navy has been working to correct new mission, current mission and replacement and modernization deficiencies.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Fiscal year—							
	1971		1972		1973		(Requested) 1974	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
New mission.....	84.6	25.5	102.3	28.6	168.4	32.5	336.5	48.2
Current mission.....	102.3	30.9	133.8	37.4	137.3	26.5	146.0	20.9
Replacement and modernization.....	144.3	43.6	122.1	34.0	212.6	41.0	214.9	30.9
Total.....	331.2		358.2		518.3		697.4	

The Committee believes that programs of at least the size of that approved for FY 1974 will be required in the future to provide the most urgently required projects included in the Navy's construction backlog.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force's construction backlog of facility requirements for the active force has been estimated at \$6.8 billion. This Committee is advised that this is approximately 29 percent of the total DOD deficit of \$23.2 billion and, that this backlog is in all categories of facilities. Further, these deficiencies are most noticeable in the operations, maintenance, medical, bachelor housing, and community support areas. The distribution of this year's funding request fully supports this contention.

The Committee notes with particular interest that the Air Force has placed an increased emphasis on the replacement and modernization of its physical plant. Most noteworthy is the emphasis on improved living conditions. Funds for replacement and modernization have increased substantially from a low of \$5 million in FY69 to \$110 million in FY73, and this year's fund request of \$192 million, or 69 percent of the total amount requested for Air Force construction,

is a positive reflection of its stated intentions to place primary emphasis on identifying existing facilities which can be economically altered, or modernized to the new requirements and whose usable life is extensible.

The Committee is cognizant of the fact that future progress in overcoming this deficit in construction hinges largely on a marked reduction in inflationary trends of the nation's economy and the ultimate development of a funding level capable of liquidating current deficiencies while maintaining an appropriate effort to cope with the changing status of today's usable facilities.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

ARMY

The Committee notes that the Army is continuing its aggressive policy of programing projects to control air and water pollution. During the program years 1968 through 1973 this committee has approved appropriations for air and water pollution control projects in the aggregate amounts of \$72.4 million and \$117.2 million respectively. The Army program this year is somewhat reduced from recent years, amounting to \$7.3 million for air pollution control and \$7.1 million for water pollution control.

Passage of PL 92-500 in October 1972 placed further requirements on both government and industry in controlling water pollution. The Army advises that future year requests will be made for water pollution control projects to meet these new requirements.

NAVY

Since fiscal year 1968 this Committee has approved appropriations in the amount of \$52 million for air pollution abatement projects and \$146 million for water pollution abatement projects at Naval activities. This year's program includes an additional \$27.636 million for air pollution abatement projects and \$55.107 million for water pollution abatement projects.

These projects will reduce particulate, smoke and gaseous emissions into the atmosphere, provide solid waste disposal facilities, treatment and collection facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes, and facilities to improve oil handling capability to conform to local, state and Federal standards.

The projects included in the Navy request will correct all known cases in which Naval activities are in violation of local air and water standards except where projects should be delayed in order to phase the projects with the facilities of local governmental bodies; these projects where design of the facility will not have progressed to the point where contracts may be awarded during the fiscal year; and, those projects that are pushing the state of the art, i.e., where a satisfactory method of abating the pollution has not been found, so that detailed design may be started. Additional requirements can be expected as more stringent standards are established by local, state or Federal governments.

Significant increases have occurred in the Navy's pollution abatement programs over the last several years. The following table com-

compares this year's budget request for air and water pollution with prior appropriations:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Air	Water	Total	Appropriation (NOA)	Percent of program
Fiscal year:					
1968-----	\$0	\$23,382	\$23,382	\$486,661	5
1969-----	6,178	4,904	11,082	291,513	4
1970-----	4,100	20,815	24,915	300,028	8
1971-----	1,210	25,899	27,109	302,483	9
1972-----	15,962	20,295	36,257	355,500	10
1973-----	24,194	51,216	75,410	517,830	15
Subtotal-----	51,644	146,511	198,155	2,254,015	9
1974-----	27,636	55,107	82,743	608,467	14
Subtotal-----	79,280	201,618	280,898	2,862,482	10
1975-79-----	134,423	203,248	337,671	-----	-----

Note: The committee recognizes that additional requirements for pollution abatement will be generated as more stringent air and water standards are established by local, State, and Federal governments.

AIR FORCE

The Committee notes that, in keeping with national environmental protection policies, the Air Force is continuing its program for abating pollution at all its installations. Working from a base of an investment of over \$250 million in facilities for wastewater collection and disposal, the Air Force has, since 1967, spent over \$121 million from all accounts for pollution abatement at its installations.

Of this amount, this Committee has approved Military Construction appropriations of \$31 million for air pollution abatement projects and \$54 million for water pollution abatement projects. This year we propose \$9.8 million for projects to assure compliance with current air and water quality standards.

The \$9.8 million proposed in this year's bill (over 3% of the regular Military Construction Program), consists of 21 line items of which \$6.1 million is for control of water pollution and \$3.7 million is for air pollution control. The air pollution control projects reflect the initial state implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 and are primarily directed toward providing vapor recovery systems for fuel tanks and providing controls at the Eielson AFB heating plant to enable the Air Force to use coal and still comply with air quality standards.

The water pollution control projects represent the initial steps to compliance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. These provide for sanitary and industrial waste treatment and connection to municipal or regional systems where feasible. Also included are projects for complying with new host nation standards established for several overseas installations. The Committee has been advised that all projects included in the bill have been coordinated with the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Committee anticipates much larger environmental protection construction programs in the future as more stringent quality standards are promulgated by the several states and the Environmental Protection Agency under recent legislation. The Air Force is expected to continue to play a leadership role in environmental restoration and protection.

The Committee endorses the pollution abatement program and is approving the full amount approved for authorization. As indicated in previous reports, the Committee considers pollution abatement of equal importance with mission essential requirements at Defense installations.

ACCESS ROADS

ARMY

The Defense Access Roads program is to respond, on a fairly short reaction time, to access road requirements important to national defense. The program supplements construction of access highways to defense activities otherwise provided in the public roads program which normally require a three to five-year lead time. Over the past decade, the Army portion of the program has averaged approximately \$1 million per year. No funds were originally requested in the fiscal year 1974 Army program because no specific project requirements had been identified. Also a reasonable unobligated balance was available from prior year appropriations to respond to unforeseen requirements. Subsequent to the budget submittal, late developing projects have been undertaken utilizing a large portion of the unobligated funds available. The Army access roads program will therefore require an infusion of new funds in future budgets to retain a responsive posture.

The Committee added \$2,000,000 for the Army.

NAVY

For a number of years, the Navy has received \$1,000,000 for urgent access road projects for which authorization is obtained from United States Code, Title 23, Section 210. In last year's appropriation bill, the Navy was given \$3,000,000 to reduce the mounting backlog of unfunded access road projects. However, because of increased construction costs and new requirements, the Navy still has an unfunded backlog over \$6,000,000. The Committee feels it prudent to fund this year at the \$2,000,000 level to reduce the backlog of these urgent projects. Therefore, the Committee approved \$2,000,000 for access roads.

With the funding of \$2,000,000, the Navy anticipates satisfying a majority of the following urgent access road requirements through the Federal Highway Administration during the fiscal year 1974:

West entrance road—NAS Pensacola, Fla.....	\$750, 000
4-lane improvement—NAS Meridian, Miss.....	417, 000
Road improvements—Virginia Beach, Va., housing.....	228, 000
Entrance way improvements—NSB New London, Conn.....	50, 000
Entrance way improvements—Little Creek, Va., housing.....	100, 000
Entrance improvements—NH Pensacola, Fla.....	25, 000
Street improvements—NTC Orlando, Fla.....	275, 000
Road improvements—MCAS Yuma, Ariz.....	332, 600
Road relocation—NADC Warminster, Pa.....	822, 400
Total	3, 000, 000

AIR FORCE

Since 1968 the Air Force has received a total of \$6,500,000 in new appropriation for defense access road needs. These funds are fully committed to projects which are under construction or are in an advanced stage of design. New requirements have been recently identified in the amount of \$5,300,000; however, because of budgetary restrictions and other operational priority requirements, the Air Force has not been able to include funds for these requirements in its appropriation request.

In addition, the Committee notes with particular interest that Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi has made known a requirement to improve Pass Christian Road in the city of Biloxi. This heavily traveled two lane road is used by over 12,100 vehicles per day which are generated solely by the Air Base. Further, that historically, in the event of a national disaster, this is the only base access road available for evacuation of personnel and valuable equipment. Both the City of Biloxi and Keesler Air Force Base agree that the only positive solution to this requirement is to reconstruct Pass Christian Road to four lanes.

The Committee further notes that the Air Force recommends that this project be certified and the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service has indicated that they will certify the project. Defense access road funds in the amount of \$3,000,000 will be required. Therefore, in view of the existing backlog of unfunded requirements, and this urgent project at Keesler Air Force Base, the Committee believes that funds in the amount of \$2,000,000 should be provided now so that construction can begin on this worthwhile project. The Committee has approved \$2,000,000 for access roads.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

ARMY

The Army's fiscal year 1973 obligation for planning and design, excluding SAFEGUARD and Site Defense, totalled \$30.4 million. An additional \$0.3 million was utilized for SAFEGUARD and Site Defense design. The unobligated design funds carried over from FY 1973 to FY 1974 for the regular Military Construction, Army program was \$5.7 million. The Army has requested \$39 million for planning and design in FY 1974, which is consistent with the increased design program anticipated. No additional design funds were requested for SAFEGUARD or Site Defense.

It is noted that the Army's cost for design effort (excluding SAFEGUARD) on projects deleted by the Congress, revisions to conform to new standards and redesign for changed conditions, totalled approximately \$3.9 million over the last 2 years. The advance design process permits orderly development of designs in advance of appropriations for construction which allows earlier award of construction contracts, thereby avoiding cost escalation that would more than offset the cost of lost design effort. The FY 1972 and FY 1973 lost

design costs were 0.94% of construction expenditures for those two years as compared to an average construction cost escalation rate of 9.7% per year during this period. The Committee urges the Army to continue its efforts to improve management of design and construction to the end that a greater portion of the annual program is contracted as early as possible to reduce the adverse impact of cost escalation.

Unlike construction, for which cost of supervision and administration is billed to customers at a flat-rate, design services are billed at actual costs to include both A-E contract costs and a proportionate share of related District office supervisory and administrative costs. Costs of general supervision at Division office and Headquarters levels are not billed.

NAVY

The funds provided each year for planning and design are used to assure the development of sound scope and good cost estimates for projects submitted to Congress for consideration, and to develop final designs in time to allow award of construction contracts for these projects in the budget year. The Navy exerts continuous management effort on the orderly development of designs in order to assure timely construction awards with minimum lost design effort. These planning funds are also used for the design of Urgent Minor and Emergency Construction projects, special studies and the preparation of standard, definitive plans. Approximately 90 percent of the appropriation for this planning and design effort is used for contracts to architect-engineer firms and the remaining 10 percent is used for in-house design.

As of 30 June 1973 the Navy's unobligated balance of funds appropriated for planning and design was \$353,542. The original appropriation request for planning and design by the Navy in the FY 1974 Military Construction, Navy Program was \$53,800,000. Subsequently, the Secretary of Defense increased this request by \$4,000,000 to cover a deficiency in Navy planning and design funds caused primarily by the acceleration of the medical facilities modernization and pollution abatement programs.

This committee recommends appropriation of funds for planning and design in the amount of \$57,800,000.

Of the total requested by the Navy \$10,800,000 is for planning and design of the support facilities for the TRIDENT Weapons System. Planning and design fund obligations during FY 1973 for TRIDENT were \$1,171,345. The TRIDENT obligation rate will accelerate during FY 1974. Should additional funds be required for TRIDENT, they will be obtained from appropriated planning and design funds and funds remaining will be applied to the planning and design of other military construction projects.

AIR FORCE

On June 30, 1973, the unobligated availability in Air Force planning and design funds was \$5,115,642, all of which was required to complete the design of the fiscal year 1974 program presently under review by the Congress. Of this amount, all but approximately \$0.6 million has

been funded to the design agents to be applied to the design completion of the fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Program. It is anticipated that all of these funds will be obligated prior to the end of 1973.

The \$18 million of design funds requested in the Air Force fiscal year 1974 Program are intended for completion of the design of this program, initiation of design of the fiscal year 1975 Program, and advance planning and concept design for medical facilities in the proposed fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Program. In the past five years, the Air Force has received appropriations for planning and design as follows:

Fiscal year :	<i>Millions</i>
1969 -----	\$16. 0
1970 -----	23. 6
1971 -----	17. 0
1972 -----	17. 0
1973 -----	17. 0

CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

ARMY

During fiscal 1973, the Army's Corps of Engineers continued the close management required to produce quality and economy in construction and at the same time maintained its charges for construction supervision and administration at the 5.0 percent rate established on 1 July 1972. These charges for construction supervision and administration have been progressively reduced from a 7.5 percent rate in effect in 1963 when the system was instigated to the 5.0 percent rate currently in effect through intensive management to adjust organization to meet workload changes and a continuing program to improve techniques and management. Additionally, one-time savings totalling approximately \$3.1 million in FY 72 and \$0.8 million in FY 73 were refunded by crediting to each affected project 0.6% of the cost of direct construction placed in FY 72 and 0.15% of the cost of direct construction placed in FY 73. Thus the final charge to the user was reduced to approximately 4.5% in FY 72 and 4.85% in FY 73. The committee urges the Army to continue its cost effective techniques and methods of construction supervision and management. The Committee will continue to monitor very closely the S.I.O.H. costs that the Corps of Engineers charges the Army for construction.

NAVY

The Committee is aware of the progress the Navy has made in developing cost effective procedures to minimize the costs for planning and design of military facilities. Among these procedures are the management techniques being used to reduce the expenditure of funds during the planning stage by making optimum use of standard, repetitive designs with good historical cost data. Further, a combination of design concepts has been developed which permits evaluation and selection of the most cost effective method available. Among the more notable of these have been the master designs for bachelor quarters whereby a single design is site adapted and constructed at many loca-

tions, the use of design/construction contracting (turnkey) procedures, and the use of computer-aided design. It is encouraging to note the success that the Navy has had in the use of turnkey construction and the fact that this concept is being considered for further applications.

This Committee notes the Navy's continued efforts to provide supervision and inspection at minimum cost.

The current overhead rate of 6 percent is still considered high and the Committee would like to see this reduced further. However, the Committee is aware that construction administration costs within the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Headquarters are charged to supervision, inspections and overhead. Headquarters costs are funded from operation and maintenance appropriations in the Army and Air Force Program.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

The NATO Infrastructure program is under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs). Department of the Army is the executive agent for the program. This program provides the facilities necessary to support NATO military forces which are intended for common use or have a high degree of common interest. The program covers such varied items as airfields, air defense facilities, communications, missile sites, war headquarters, nuclear storage sites, pipelines, and Petroleum, Oils and Lubricants depots.

Now that the program has provided most of the basic facilities required in the common defense, its character is gradually changing. The requirement for major air and naval installations has given way to the new requirement for modernization and expansion of existing basic facilities. Airfields must be improved so that they can support today's more complex aircraft. The Petroleum, Oils and Lubricants system must be modified to insure its ability to function, in an emergency, independent of that part of the system located in France. Progress in technology has resulted in a dramatic change in the communications area. One example is the project for the NATO satellite communications system, which was based on the U.S. interim defense communication satellite system. On January 27, 1971, the second NATO-funded communication satellite was launched from Cape Kennedy. Both satellites, now in orbit, are performing very well. Replacement satellites are programmed for launch in 1975. Another example is the semiautomation and integration of NATO's early warning system to provide a control and reporting system for the air defense of Allied Europe. In order to make the program fully responsive to the needs of the new NATO "flexible response" strategy and associated force planning, we must provide facilities to support reinforcement on the flanks, improved air defense, and conventional capabilities for NATO air forces.

In 1970 the NATO Defense Planning Committee approved the financing of a 5-year infrastructure program for the years 1970-74—Slices XXI through XXV—and agreed that the ceiling be set at \$700 million. The agreement provides that NATO military commanders will program those urgent military requirements which can be accom-

plished within the ceiling, and report the financial condition after programming of Slice XXIV in 1973. The current costsharing formula—U.S. share 29.67 percent—remains unchanged, but the recent devaluation of the dollar will result in a higher dollar cost.

In December 1970, the Eurogroup—NATO less France, Portugal, United States, and Canada—offered an additional \$420 million to the infrastructure program as part of the European Defense Improvement Program—EDIP—to permit urgent implementation of the NATO Integrated Communications System and of the NATO aircraft shelter program. The Eurogroup has since announced that the entire \$420 million will be made available to Supreme Allied Commander, Europe for the shelter program, thus permitting early recoupment of United States funds spent in constructing shelters on a prefinanced basis and relieving the pressure on the infrastructure funds to allow programming of additional NATO Integrated Communications System projects.

Each year the major NATO commanders draw up a list of construction or modernization projects which they consider essential for the support of their forces. These projects are reviewed multilaterally by the participating nations within the NATO Military Committee, the NATO Infrastructure Committee, and finally within the Defense Planning Committee (which is the North Atlantic Council without France). The projects finally selected make up the yearly Infrastructure Program or Slice. In the United States, each proposed annual slice is reviewed thoroughly within the executive branch, starting with the interested subordinate military commands and continuing through the U.S. Commander in Chief, Europe, and the Commander in Chief, Atlantic, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military departments, the Department of State, and all interested offices within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The approved NATO slice is an approved list of military construction requirements and nothing more. After slice approval, the host country in which a project is to be built takes full responsibility for the work. It must obtain the necessary land (at its own expense), plan utilities connections and access roads (which it later builds at its own expense), prepare engineering plans and specifications, and develop cost estimates. When all is ready, the host country submits the project with all supporting data to the NATO Payments and Progress Committee for construction authorization and fund commitment. Before agreeing, the Payments and Progress Committee satisfies itself that the project still represents a valid military requirement, conforms to NATO criteria, is reasonable in cost, and is in other respects eligible under NATO Infrastructure rules. When the Payments and Progress Committee authorizes construction of an Infrastructure project, the United States obligates funds for its share of that project.

The new orientation of the program is providing a large proportion of facilities needed by the United States forces. In particular, it supports controlled humidity storage to maintain in good condition the equipment of our dual-based forces. The program will also include aircraft survival measures which are now being implemented by the United States Air Force, with the approval of Congress, on a "pre-financed" basis.

The 1972 program includes an air weapons training facility in the Mediterranean to replace the facility lost in Libya. It also contains vital fuel facilities for the United States Navy, and contemplates additional facilities in the 1973 program for the naval bases in Sicily and Crete. The proposed Slice XXIII Infrastructure program includes airfield protection, including shelters, at Ramstein, Zweibrucken, Bitburg, Spangdahlen, and Aviano. Additional shelters have been programmed in Slice XXIV and more have been proposed for Slice XXV. Reimbursement will be effected after Slice approval and subsequent to submittal by host nations and approval by the NATO Payments and Progress Committee of individual estimates. This process requires 12 months and longer.

The United States enjoys a greater benefit from this NATO program than could be expected from the size of our contribution. Excluding facilities for common use by all nations—facilities which would in any case have required common funding—the United States has had significant success in convincing NATO that U.S. programs are worthwhile. In 1968 Slice XVIII included U.S. projects in the amount of 40 percent of all projects for use by national forces. In Slice XIX this percentage rose to 47 percent; for Slice XX to 55 percent, for Slice XXI, 68 percent, and for Slice XXII, 58 percent. In the five annual programs therefore, over 56 percent of all such national user projects were programmed for benefit of U.S. forces, but the U.S. contribution remains at 29.67 percent of the entire program (or some 18 percent if the Euro-Group EDIP contribution is added to the total of normal Infrastructure funding). It is apparent, therefore, that the U.S. has a distinct financial interest in the continuing success of the NATO Infrastructure Program and that as long as U.S. national programs fit into the available common funds, the U.S. will benefit directly from this NATO effort.

The initial request for fiscal year 1974 for the U.S. share of the common funded NATO Infrastructure Program is \$80,000,000 in authorization, \$60,000,000 in total obligation authority and \$40,000,000 in new obligation authority. Subsequently a budget amendment was submitted requesting an additional \$25,300,000 in authorization and total obligational authority and \$4,300,000 in new obligational authority. However, this amendment was received too late to be acted upon by Congress. These funds are required to meet U.S. obligations during FY 1974. These projects were previously approved by NATO in the NATO annual programs (Slices) and received final approval for construction and funding from the NATO Payments Progress Committee. It is anticipated that recoupments from projects pre-financed will total \$26,000,000 in FY 1974.

The high cost of recent dollar devaluations is having an increasingly adverse impact on the ability of the United States to support and participate in the NATO Infrastructure program. The total cost of U.S. dollar devaluations in FY 1973-74, for the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure program is \$63 million. FY 1973 costs are \$23 million, none of which were provided for in the DOD FY 1973 budget. These unbudgeted FY 1973 costs were accommodated by canceling and deobligating \$10.3 million of projects and deferring \$12.7 million projects to FY 1974. Including provision for projects deferred from FY 1973, the devaluation of the dollar will increase the cost

of the FY 1974 program by \$52.7 million. Only \$6.7 of this requirement is provided for in the initial DOD FY 1974 budget. The situation is approaching the point where the U.S. will be forced to defer participation in the infrastructure program because of a lack of funds. The impact of non-participation by the U.S. is outlined by Deputy Secretary of Defense Clements in a recent letter to the Chairman, Committee on Appropriations United States Senate, as follows:

"Such a U.S.-caused moratorium would be seriously disruptive. It would run completely counter to past U.S. exhortations that NATO countries improve their military forces and do more for themselves. It would inevitably lead to diplomatic protests that internal U.S. procedures are preventing these countries from using their own funds to construct high priority military projects. There would also be an adverse effect on U.S. military posture, because we have in recent years enjoyed a very substantial return on our Infrastructure investment in the form of projects benefitting U.S. forces. Further, the Allies could question the seriousness of our proposal for a larger 1975-1979 program with a reduced U.S. cost share if we are unable to meet the requirements of the existing program.

"NATO Infrastructure is a continuing program, where U.S. actions are taken pursuant to commitments previously made by the U.S. We have agreed to a long range (five year) cost sharing plan. This has been reaffirmed in terms of specific projects at time of approval of the annual slice programs. Any U.S. action to delay project implementation would be seriously damaging to the Alliance and to the U.S., since most of the national user projects are for U.S. Forces."

The cost of the dollar devaluation is displayed below:

Cost of devaluation, fiscal year 1974

	<i>Millions</i>
Increase in unliquidated obligations (\$176 million times 11.1 percent)----	\$20.0
May 8, 1972, revaluation NATO IAU (reflecting Dec. 18, 1971, dollar devaluation) -----	5.0
Feb. 12, 1973, dollar devaluation, fiscal year 1974 projects-----	8.0
Increased cost fiscal year 1974 expenditures (official Feb. 12, 1973, dollar versus foreign exchange)-----	7.0
Total cost dollar devaluation, fiscal year 1974 program-----	40.0
Projects deferred fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974-----	12.7
Total increased requirement fiscal year 1974 budget, due to dollar devaluation -----	52.7

Proposed additional funding

Included in fiscal year 1974 initial budget (including \$1.7 million carry-over) -----	6.7
Total unbudgeted-----	46.0
Fiscal year 1973 reprogramming from Safeguard, approved November 1, 1973 -----	\$20.7
Balance not provided for in initial budget or through reprogramming -----	25.3
Additional reprogramming from Safeguard, requested fiscal year 1974 budget amendment -----	15.0
Estimated additional recoupment (\$26 million versus \$20 million), forecast fiscal year 1974 budget amendment-----	6.0
Additional fiscal year 1974 NOA, requested fiscal year 1974 budget amendment -----	4.8

TOTAL FUNDING FISCAL YEAR 1974

	NOA	TOA
Initial DOD fiscal year budget.....	\$40.0	\$60.0
Fiscal year 1974 budget amendment request.....	4.3	25.3
Total fiscal year 1974 budget request.....	44.3	85.3

The Navy's proposed FY 1974 Military Construction Program includes \$6.0 million of projects eligible or partially eligible for NATO common funding. These projects are being proposed for prefinancing to achieve early completion in support of urgent operational requirements in the Mediterranean Sea.

The projects in Navy's proposed FY 1974 Military Construction Program considered fully or partially eligible for NATO common funding are shown below:

Location	Amount (millions)	Eligible for NATO funding
Sigonella, Sicily, photo building.....	\$0.3	Partially eligible.
Souda Bay, Crete, parking apron.....	2.7	Do.
Souda Bay, Crete, air terminal.....	.6	Do.
Souda Bay, Crete, warehouse.....	.5	Do.
Eleusis, Greece, airfield facilities.....	1.9	Eligible. Submitted as sec. 202 emergent project.
Total.....	6.0	

The estimated total amount prefinanced by Navy for FY 1973 and prior is \$14.7 million. As of 31 December 1972, \$0.7 million of the prefinanced amount had been recouped from NATO. The \$14.0 million balance is currently considered potentially recoupable from NATO Infrastructure, after the individual projects are included in a NATO program (Slice). Slice 23 approved in February 1973, included \$0.5 million of the \$14.0 million balance, and recoupment of this \$0.5 million is anticipated shortly. Slice 24, pending approval by NATO, includes an additional \$0.4 million for Navy prefinanced projects. Navy's projected recoupment from NATO Slice 25 is \$5 million.

The Committee approved these projects for military construction prefinancing with the understanding that the Navy will make every effort to recover the funds from future NATO programs.

OFFSET AGREEMENT, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

ARMY

In fiscal year 1968, the United States Army, Europe initiated a concerted effort to upgrade troop living conditions in the 165 kasernes housing Army troops in Germany. The major effort involved complete renovation of barracks and dining facilities in 120 of the worst kasernes, emphasizing complete rehabilitation of latrines, shower rooms, heating systems, lighting, electrical outlets, structural features, and painting. This program came to be called stem-to-stern and originally was estimated to cost an average of \$4 to \$6 per square foot compared to approximately \$25 per square foot for new construction in Germany.

Stem-to-stern work was financed at 26 kasernes with a total of \$82.4 million of Operation and Maintenance, Army funds from five fiscal year budgets, fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1972. Due to contract change orders the total cost is now \$76 million. Except for the effort of Labor Service forces, the work was contracted for directly by the United States Army Engineer Command, Europe, which supervises the construction through their field organization. The rehabilitation is now complete at 24 kasernes and nearly complete at the other two.

Under the 10 December 1971 Offset Agreement, the Federal Republic of Germany provided 600 million Deutsche marks during fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for services and deliveries for modernization, construction and improvement of barracks, accommodations, housing and troop facilities of U.S. forces in Germany. Army's share was 576 million Deutsche marks and Air Force's was 24 million Deutsche marks per agreement between Commander in Chief, United States Army, Europe and Commander in Chief, United States Air Force, Europe. The Federal Republic of Germany will continue the rehabilitation of the Army troop billets and dining facilities that are in the stem-to-stern program as well as those at other sites where stem-to-stern is not contemplated. It was estimated that available funding would be adequate to cover the next 61 kasernes on the United States Army, Europe, priority listing.

The Offset rehabilitation work, to United States criteria and specifications, is contracted for and administered by the German construction authorities. At the time of the agreement, the Engineer Command had stem-to-stern design packages for 10 kasernes essentially completed and turned over to the Federal Republic of Germany authorities before the end of January 1972. The first contract, for Drake-Edwards Kaserne in Frankfurt, was awarded on an expedited basis on 21 January 1972. Twenty additional kaserne design packages were completed and turned over to the Federal Republic of Germany authorities during the period April to June 1972.

During fiscal year 1973 progress continued very satisfactorily and by 1 September 1973 renovation under the Offset program had been completed at Wilkins Kaserne and contracts were underway at 43 others at a total current working estimate of 457 million Deutsche marks. In addition, the German construction authorities had advertised projects for 11 more kasernes and 27 border and remote sites.

The remaining requirements to complete the rehabilitation of troop barracks and dining facilities have been proposed by the Department of Defense for inclusion in the next round of Offset negotiations. The Committee hopes that action will be taken by the Department of Defense and the Army to negotiate another Offset program to rehabilitate the remaining Kasernes.

AIR FORCE

The December 10, 1971 Offset Agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany resulted in the United States Air Forces, Europe receiving \$7.2 million to upgrade 69 barracks at eight bases.

The Committee notes that as of September 1, 1973, construction was complete at four bases, with the remaining four ranging from 75 to 98 percent. The total program is 93 percent complete.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

ARMY

Although most of the Army's urgent construction requirements are met through regular Military Construction, Army (MCA) programming, unanticipated requirements develop which must be accomplished on a more timely basis than provided by normal MCA programming. Minor construction funding is the only method available to accomplish these facility needs. Work accomplished under this minor construction authority in the past fiscal year has touched nearly all facility classes contributing to Army readiness. Recently, minor construction activity has increased, due in great part to the turbulence within the Army caused by troop redeployments to the United States from Vietnam, and reorganization and realignment of the Army with changes in missions or functions and troop relocations. This higher level of activity is expected to continue and has generated a larger dollar request to support minor construction in fiscal year 1974.

NAVY

The Navy has made increased use of minor construction authority over the past few years. During fiscal year 1974, major emphasis is on short establishment realignment facilities moves and construction. There has also been an increased use of the new three-year pay-back criteria and new emphasis developing with respect to fuel conservation. Future increases in the requirement for military construction can be expected in these areas. Additionally, continuing cost escalation will further erode the scope that can be accomplished with the current project limits and will reduce the number of valid requirements that can be satisfied through the program.

AIR FORCE

The Committee notes that the construction accomplished under the Minor Construction Program supports rapid changes in technology and mission deployments that are vital for effective military operations. Adequate support facilities have been or are being provided such as: bachelor housing in Alaska and Korea, additional storage capacity for heating fuel oil at 17 CONUS locations, and mission deployments generated by base closures. Operational safety has been enhanced at bases by the installation of navigational aids, aircraft arresting barriers and runway lighting. Classified missions, affecting the defense posture of the United States, have been supported. Total fund requirements depend upon the number of situations which arise throughout the year that can be certified as being urgently required so that they cannot be deferred until the next regular construction program. With the enactment of PL 92-145, however, special consid-

eration was provided for projects that will, within three years following completion of the project, result in savings in operation and maintenance costs in excess of the cost of the project. The Air Force has stated that the number and cost of such projects will be closely monitored to preclude any loss in flexibility in providing support for urgent projects. To date 10 projects having a total funded cost of \$1,255,300 and claiming first three year savings having a present value of \$2,165,300 have been approved.

[NAVY TRIDENT SUBMARINE WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT COMPLEX

The Committee has approved \$112,320,000 for construction at Bangor, Washington and Cape Canaveral, Florida to support the TRIDENT system.

The TRIDENT system is being developed to insure that our nation has a modern, survivable strategic deterrent system in the 1980's and beyond. TRIDENT will preserve the sufficiency and high credibility of our strategic deterrent throughout this century. It will be available to replace current sea-based strategic systems as technology advances and age reduces their mission effectiveness and be assigned to augment current strategic deterrent systems. Finally, it will have greater survivability due to the large available operating area made possible by the longer range of the new missile.

The total military construction program identified with the deployment of ten TRIDENT submarines is expected to extend through FY 1979 with a total facilities costs, excluding family housing, of about \$510 million dollars. With the addition of \$33 million dollars for planning and design, the total cost will be about \$543 million dollars.

When the program was presented a year ago, the cost estimated for facilities was approximately \$1 billion dollars. The Navy was able to reduce the cost by the following methods:

(a) Elimination of depot level submarine maintenance at the TRIDENT Support Complex site and the transfer of this support to shipyards.

(b) Reduction of the military manning level by the transfer of some functions to civilian personnel with a resultant reduction in bachelor and family housing facilities requirements.

(c) Reduction of the facility support level from 15 to 10 ships lowered the facilities requirements.

(d) Re-examination of the requirement for concurrent high explosive operations and reductions in some of the explosive safety factors internal to the base permitted a reduction in the land required at the Bangor Support Complex.

(e) More detailed examination of the facilities cost for the Bangor site vice the use of an estimate that would approximate the cost of any one of four candidate sites.

The Trident Military Construction program for FY 1974 includes facilities at both Cape Canaveral and the Trident Support Complex, Bangor, Washington. Those at Cape Canaveral are the missile flight test facilities. The facilities are required in FY 1974 so that the missile development flight test program may commence in 1975.

The facilities required at the Trident Support Complex, Bangor are as follows:

(a) Trident Training Facility (1st Increment): This facility is required in fiscal year 1974 so that construction and equipment installation can be completed in time to meet the required ready-for-training date of 1 January 1977. This will be the start of training for the second Trident crew. The first crew will have to be factory trained.

(b) Covered Explosive Handling Wharf #1: Refit Pier #1. These facilities are required in fiscal year 1974 to allow construction at the waterfront to proceed in an orderly, efficient manner, to avoid an unacceptable high peak workload, and thus to reduce the environmental impact of the construction.

(c) Utilities (1st Increment): Site Improvements (1st Increment). These facilities are required in fiscal year 1974 so that the primary roads and utility systems may be in place prior to the start of the peak construction period. They are required to provide electric power to the construction sites and access to the sites in the extremely rainy winter weather encountered at Bangor.

(d) Land Acquisition. Funds for land acquisition are required in fiscal year 1974 so that negotiations with the land owners can begin as soon as possible. Land acquisition can often become bogged down in protracted negotiations involving court suits. It is essential that these negotiations begin early in the program. Additionally, it will increase public support for the Trident Support Complex if land owners are dealt with promptly and fairly and not left holding their land longer than is necessary.

The Committee accepts the Navy reasoning and endorses the above timetable. The Committee expressed its general support of the Trident program by approving \$13.5 million in fiscal year 1973 for planning of the program.

NAVY, ATHENS HOMEPORTING

The Committee has approved construction to enable the homeporting of a destroyer squadron and an aircraft carrier in Athens, Greece in the belief that this will enable the Navy to continue to meet its overseas commitments while undergoing reductions in manpower and ship force levels. The Navy asserts that without homeporting in Greece two carrier task groups cannot be kept operational in the Mediterranean, given the reduction from fifteen to twelve aircraft carriers in future years and All-Volunteer Force constraints.

A secondary purpose of homeporting offered by the Navy is the improvement of morale and the increasing of personnel retention rates and enlistments caused by allowing its men to live with their families in Athens and reducing family separations. Family separation is a major cause of low retention. In this respect, this initiative will conserve the Navy's most vital resource—skilled people. Homeporting will reduce the need for carriers and escorts to make rotational transits from East coast bases to the Mediterranean at six month intervals. This benefit accrues to Navy personnel homeported in the United States as well as overseas.

The Committee notes that Athens homeporting will not increase the number of Navy personnel in the Mediterranean. The long-standing two carrier task group force level will remain unchanged. The homeported ships simply replace ships formerly in the Mediterranean on rotational deployment.

Phase I, including the homeporting in Athens of the Task Force Commander and staff, and a six ship destroyer squadron, was completed in September 1972. A Fleet Support Office was established in July 1972 to coordinate establishment of schools, medical/dental facilities and the execution of leases. All facility support requirements are provided by lease or lease-construction. A Technical Arrangement between the U.S. Navy and Greek Navy has been signed.

The program approved this year will allow implementation of the second phase of the Athens homeporting plan.

Phase II has been approved in principal by the Government of Greece and State Department. A dependents' support ship (USS SANCTUARY) will be homeported to provide medical/dental support. This phase will also homeport one aircraft carrier and one air wing in Athens.

The Committee notes that the Navy's current estimate of costs associated with homeporting in Greece are within original estimates as shown below:

[In millions]

	Recurring costs		Nonrecurring costs	
	Original	Current	Original	Current
Additional PCS.....	\$3.5	\$4.1	\$3.0	-----
Dependent support ship.....	2.5	.9	10.8	\$10.7
Expansion and operation of USAF facilities.....	2.8	3.0	.2	.3
Port operations, charter, hire and pier costs.....	3.0	1.2	-----	.1
Logistics costs.....	1.7	2.7	-----	.7
Airfield operations.....	1.0	.4	.4	1.9
Subtotal.....	14.5	12.3	14.4	13.7
Savings from reduced transits.....	1.1	1.0	-----	-----
Total.....	13.4	11.3	-----	-----

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

The Committee has approved a total of \$567,735,000 for Military Construction for the Active Forces, and \$75,900,000 for the Reserve Forces.

For the Active Forces, the Committee allowance represents a reduction of \$97,165,000 in the budget estimate of \$664,900,000 and is \$153,780,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1973. A detailed tabulation by installation and states follows. Army family housing is not included in the above figures but is presented in a subsequent portion of this report. A tabulation of the Committee action by major Army Commands and special programs follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Approved by committee
Inside United States:			
1st Army.....	\$66,891	\$43,750	\$43,750
3d Army.....	153,476	146,493	144,533
5th Army.....	155,697	143,713	146,452
6th Army.....	37,745	34,640	34,640
U.S. Army Materiel Command.....	58,649	42,995	43,451
U.S. Army Security Agency.....	287	0	0
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command.....	8,226	8,226	8,226
U.S. Army Military Academy.....	30,145	5,145	25,145
Army Medical Department.....	12,827	13,535	13,535
Corps of Engineers.....	597	0	597
Military traffic management and terminal service.....	5,716	1,971	4,171
U.S. Army Alaska.....	8,344	7,915	7,915
U.S. Army Hawaii.....	10,825	9,592	10,825
Air pollution abatement.....	7,295	6,900	7,295
Water pollution abatement.....	7,099	7,099	7,099
Total, inside United States.....	563,819	471,974	497,634
Outside United States:			
U.S. Army Forces Southern Command.....	8,095	8,095	8,095
U.S. Army Pacific—Korea.....	1,568	1,568	1,568
Puerto Rico.....	517	517	517
Kwajalein Missile Range.....	2,353	1,029	1,029
U.S. Army Security Agency.....	1,434	1,434	1,434
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command.....	2,097	2,334	2,334
USAREUR Germany.....	12,517	13,124	13,124
USAREUR NATO infrastructure.....	160,000	295,650	275,650
Total, outside United States.....	188,581	2123,751	2103,751
Sec. 102.....	3,000	3,000	3,000
General support programs:			
Minor construction.....	12,500	15,000	15,000
Planning.....	39,000	39,000	39,000
Access roads.....	0	0	2,000
Total, general authorization.....	51,500	54,000	56,000
Grand total program.....	1706,900	2652,725	2660,385
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program.....	42,000	2101,150	292,560
Budget authority.....	1664,900	2551,575	2567,735

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in budget amendment.

² Reflects \$35,650,000 unobligated prior year Safeguard funds transferred to NATO Infrastructure toward meeting cost of dollar devaluations.

FIRST ARMY

In the First Army area, the Committee approved 18 projects at 10 installations at a total cost of \$43,750,000. Significant among the approved projects are barracks for enlisted men at Fort Belvoir at \$897,000, Camp Drum for \$1,099,000, Camp A.P. Hill for \$535,000, Indiantown Gap Military Reservation at \$1,657,000, Fort Lee at \$3,444,000 and Camp Pickett for \$476,000; barracks for enlisted women at Fort Devens at a cost of \$2,749,000 and Fort Lee for \$1,558,000 and, barracks modernization at Fort Eustis for \$2,577,000, Fort Knox for \$7,055,000 and Fort Meade at \$5,924,000. Other projects which are approved include an addition and alternation to Kenner Army Hospital costing \$5,310,000, a central food preparation facility estimated at \$6,876,000, and bachelor officer quarters at Fort Lee for \$1,138,000. The Committee also approved conversion of buildings to administrative facilities at Fort Knox for \$250,000, and a supply and administrative facility at Fort Eustis costing \$680,000. Also approved are a post office at \$533,000 and alteration to the electrical distribution system at Fort Eustis estimated at \$992,000.

THIRD ARMY

The Committee approved 29 projects at 9 installations in the Third Army area for a total cost of \$144,533,000. Major projects in the total are the barracks complexes at Fort Bragg for \$18,203,000, Fort Campbell at \$31,459,000, Fort Gordon at \$19,212,000, and Fort Benning for \$9,500,000; the Eglin AFB ranger training complex for Fort Benning at an estimated cost of \$2,950,000; and, modernization of barracks at Fort Benning at \$5,748,000, Fort Bragg for \$8,381,000, Fort Campbell for \$8,114,000, and Fort Rucker for \$2,402,000. Funds for projects associated with the expansion program for the Women's Army Corps are approved for barracks at Fort Bragg at \$2,399,000, Fort Jackson at \$2,902,000, Fort McClellan for \$2,739,000, and Fort Rucker for \$1,051,000; modernization of barracks at Fort Gordon costing \$1,018,000 and Fort McClellan at \$3,543,000; additional academic space estimated at \$2,695,000, bachelor officers quarters at \$1,560,000, a gymnasium for \$1,261,000, and alterations and additions to the headquarters for \$333,000 at Fort McClellan. Other projects approved are tactical equipment shops and facilities at \$2,709,000 and an administrative facility costing \$708,000 at Fort Bragg; a commissary at Fort Campbell for \$3,888,000; upgrading airfield facilities at Fort Rucker for \$534,000; phase three of the tactical airfield complex at Fort Campbell estimated at \$8,420,000; and, a central food preparation facility at Fort Benning for \$5,346,000. The Committee also approves modification of the electrical distribution system estimated at \$1,310,000 at Fort Benning, an extension of utilities for \$1,932,000 at Fort McClellan, a gas generating plant for \$264,000 at Fort Stewart, and a commissary for \$2,924,000 at Fort Gordon.

FIFTH ARMY

For the Fifth Army area the Committee approved 24 projects at 9 installations costing \$146,452,000. Major projects among those approved are barracks complexes at Fort Riley, for \$22,547,000, Fort

Polk for \$26,016,000 and Fort Leonard Wood at \$32,247,000; barracks with support facilities for Military Police for \$1,831,000 at Fort Leonard Wood; barracks at Fort Sam Houston costing \$9,474,000 and Fort Benjamin Harrison for \$746,000; an addition to barracks for enlisted women for \$1,136,000 at Fort Leonard Wood; and, barracks for enlisted women estimated at \$2,167,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison. Other projects approved include modernization of barracks for enlisted men and women at Fort Bliss totalling \$6,087,000 and Fort Sam Houston at \$932,000. Also approved are a confinement facility costing \$6,287,000 at Fort Leonard Wood, a commissary for \$1,977,000 and enlisted service club at \$1,283,000 at Fort Polk, air-conditioning of bachelor officer quarters at Fort Hood for \$630,000 and Fort Sam Houston for \$1,332,000, a maintenance evaluation facility at \$235,000 at Fort Sill, an approach control-ILS at Fort Hood for \$1,903,000, and a veterinary school facility at Fort Sheridan for \$762,000. Other major barracks modernization projects approved are: Fort Harrison for \$980,000; Fort Hood for \$7,291,000; Fort Riley for \$8,396,000; Fort Sill at \$9,212,000; and, Fort Wood \$2,981,000.

SIXTH ARMY

The Committee approved \$34,640,000 for 8 projects at 5 installations in Sixth Army. The approved program provides a barracks complex at Fort Ord for \$8,622,000; a barracks complex at Hunter Liggett Military Reservation for \$7,776,000; modernization of barracks for enlisted men at Fort Carson at \$4,615,000, Fort Lewis at \$7,127,000; and for enlisted women barracks at the Presidio of San Francisco at \$3,074,000 and barracks modernization for \$1,190,000 at Fort Ord. Also approved are dental clinics at Fort Carson for \$1,036,000 and Fort Lewis for \$1,200,000.

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

The Committee grants approval of \$43,451,000 for 23 projects at 14 Army Materiel Command installations. Significant approvals are projects for modernization of barracks at Aberdeen Proving Ground at \$4,507,000, Fort Monmouth at \$7,196,000, Picatinny Arsenal for \$225,000, Redstone Arsenal for \$3,852,000, Sacramento Army Depot at \$412,000, and White Sands Missile Range for \$670,000; barracks at Aberdeen Proving Ground for \$2,965,000, and Pine Bluff Arsenal at \$294,000; and, additions to barracks at Natick Laboratories for \$466,000 and Yuma Proving Ground costing \$1,526,000. Also approved are conversion of barracks and a classroom building to administrative facilities estimated to cost \$1,205,000 at Fort Monmouth; a multitarget launch complex for \$467,000 and phase one of land acquisition at White Sands Missile Range for \$2,706,000; an NCO open mess for \$483,000, expansion of the electrical system for \$1,777,000, and the first phase of improvements at KOFA Range costing \$2,686,000 at Yuma Proving Ground; a medical equipment maintenance facility for \$456,000 at Tobyhanna Army Depot. Approval also includes upgrading turbine engine test cells at \$1,088,000 and a supply operations and storage building for \$5,196,000 at the Aeronautical Depot Maintenance Center; and a chapel center at \$1,119,000 for Redstone Arsenal. A repair and processing vehicle facility for \$3,745,-

000 at Anniston Army Depot and security lighting for Sierra Army Depot at \$380,000 were also approved.

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

(Inside the United States)

The Committee approved \$8,226,000 for five projects at two installations. The approved projects include modernization of barracks at Fort Huachuca for \$4,702,000 and Fort Ritchie for \$1,394,000 and barracks for medical personnel at Fort Huachuca estimated to cost \$1,347,000. Also approved are improvements to the Libby Army Airfield at an estimated \$490,000 and electronic test equipment facility for \$293,000, both at Fort Huachuca.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The Committee approved \$25,145,000 for three projects at the U.S. Military Academy. These include a new hospital at \$20,000,000, modernization of barracks at \$2,245,000 and extension of utilities for \$2,900,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

The Committee approved two projects totalling \$13,535,000 for the Army Medical Department. These projects are the underground parking structure at Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) for \$10,830,000, authorized but not funded per the Army's request in fiscal year 1972, and a deficiency of \$2,705,000 for a laundry from fiscal year 1973, also for WRAMC.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Approval is granted by the Committee for four projects at three installations of the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service with a total cost of \$4,171,000. The approved projects provide barracks modernization for enlisted women at \$343,000 at Oakland Army Base, a container transfer and marshalling facility at \$1,628,000 at Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, and an electric substation for \$400,000 and administrative facilities at \$1,800,000 for Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal.

U.S. ARMY, ALASKA

The Committee approved four projects for U.S. Army, Alaska amounting to \$7,915,000. The approvals provide for barracks estimated at \$3,060,000 at Fort Greely, barracks modernization for \$2,140,000 at Fort Richardson and relocation of activities to South Post for \$1,965,000 and bachelor officer quarters modernization for \$750,000 at Fort Wainwright.

U.S. ARMY, HAWAII

Three projects for \$10,825,000 in Hawaii are approved. At Schofield Barracks the Committee approved barracks modernization at \$8,124,000 and a consolidated dining facility for \$1,468,000. A medical/dental clinic was approved at \$1,233,000 for Fort Shafter.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

One project, a logistics and storage facility, was approved at \$597,000 for the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, New Hampshire.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

In support of the national goal of reducing environmental pollution, the Committee approved the Army request for \$14,394,000 for air and water pollution abatement facilities. Of this total \$7,295,000 are for air pollution abatement projects and \$7,099,000 for water pollution control projects. The fiscal year 1974 program responds to requirements derived from increasingly more stringent standards and accomplishments projects now within technological capabilities. Larger amounts are anticipated in future programs resulting from the requirements dictated by standards established in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. The Committee endorses the pollution abatement program, and is pleased to recommend the Army pollution abatement projects.

U.S. ARMY, SOUTHERN COMMAND

The Committee approved the Army request for two projects at two installations for the US Army, Southern Command at a total cost of \$8,095,000. The most significant project is for barracks modernization for \$7,820,000 at various locations within the Panama Canal Zone. Also approved is upgrading of the airfield at Fort Sherman estimated at \$275,000.

U.S. ARMY, PACIFIC

Two projects are approved by the Committee for Korea at a cost of \$1,568,000. These are a logistics airfield for \$675,000 in the vicinity of Andong and a POL mooring system at Pohang for \$893,000.

PUERTO RICO

The Committee approved a barracks modernization project costing \$517,000 for Fort Buchanan in Puerto Rico.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

The Committee approved one project, an electrical system feeder upgrade for \$1,029,000, at the National Missile Range.

U.S. ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

(Outside the United States)

One project at an ASA overseas location, for a new barracks, is approved for \$1,434,000.

U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

(Outside the United States)

The Committee approved the Army request for a project for upgrading power at eight overseas communications sites at a cost

of \$2,097,000. Also approved was a \$237,000 deficiency for upgrading power approved in fiscal year 1973.

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

The Committee approved projects for U.S. Army Europe in the amount of \$88,774,000. Included are \$75,650,000 for NATO Infrastructure (\$20,000,000 NOA, \$20,000,000 estimated recoupments and \$35,650,000 unobligated Safeguard funds) and \$13,124,00 for installations in Germany. Major items approved for installations in Germany are additions to dependent schools located at Nuernburg Fulda and Wuerzburg totalling \$7,154,000 and new dependent schools at Baumholder and Mannheim for \$4,937,000. Also approved are barracks for enlisted men at Pruem Post estimated at \$426,000. The Committee also granted a \$607,000 deficiency for dependent school additions approved in fiscal year 1972.

CLASSIFIED LOCATION

(Inside the United States)

The Committee approved the Army's request for \$3,000,000 for a classified project.

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

The Committee approved \$56,000,000 for general authorization for the Army. The amount includes \$15,000,000 for minor construction, \$39,000,000 for planning and design, and \$2,000,000 added by the Committee for access roads.

ARMY (ARMY RESERVE)

Appropriations in the amount of \$40.7 million have been provided for the construction of Army Reserve facilities. This is consistent with Army's continuing recognition of the need to acquire adequate Reserve facilities to effect improved training and readiness and it represents the largest Army Reserve facilities construction appropriation to date.

Within this \$40.7 million amount, Army proposes to construct 19 new training centers, expand 21 existing training centers, and provide 9 other training, aircraft maintenance, and personnel support facilities. In addition, this appropriation will provide \$4.8 million to support planning, design, and various minor construction requirements.

ARMY (ARMY NATIONAL GUARD)

The Army National Guard fiscal year 1974 military construction appropriations request of \$35.2 million again demonstrates Army's continuing emphasis on the acquisition of adequate facilities for the effective training and improved readiness of its Reserve components under the Total Force Policy. It will provide a relatively balanced program of 29 armory facilities, 40 maintenance and logistical support facilities, and 10 training facilities at various state and federal installations. In addition, this appropriation will provide \$5.3 million for planning, design, and essential minor construction.

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Enlisted men's barracks complex.....	-\$11,878,000
Carlisle Barracks, Pa.: Physical conditioning facility.....	-2,465,000
Fort Dix, N.J.: Convert buildings to administrative facilities.....	-339,000
Fort Lee, Va.: Confinement facility—200 men.....	-4,443,000
Fort George G. Meade, Md.: USMA prep school facilities.....	-1,521,000
Fort Monroe, Va.: Barracks modernization.....	-867,000
Fort Bragg, N.C.: Enlisted men's service club.....	-1,071,000
Fort Gordon, Ga.: Automotive self-help garage.....	-626,000
Fort McPherson, Ga.: Barracks modernization.....	-1,804,000
Fort Hood, Tex.: Improve Robert Gray Army Airfield.....	-5,270,000
Fort Riley, Kans.: Support facilities for enlisted men's barracks complexes.....	-2,635,000
Outdoor athletic facilities, Custer Hill.....	-1,340,000
Fort MacArthur, Calif.: Barracks modernization (enlisted women).....	-428,000
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.: Barracks modernization.....	-2,677,000
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Human factors engineering research laboratory.....	-2,962,000
Chapel center.....	-1,500,000
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Mass. Dynamic deformation of materials laboratory.....	-325,000
Atlanta Army Depot, Ga.: Security fencing.....	-119,000
Fort Monmouth, N.J.: Alter classrooms for language labs.....	-2,097,000
R. & D. electronic installations facility.....	-590,000
Dental clinic—32 chair.....	-1,198,000
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J.: Explosive laboratory additions.....	-2,660,000
Savanna Army Depot, Ill.: Enlisted men's barracks with mess.....	-859,000
Bachelor officer quarters.....	-1,774,000
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: SAM-D remote area test facilities.....	-116,000
Post library.....	-339,000
Addition to Bell Gymnasium.....	-157,000
Water wells.....	-316,000
Vint Hill Farms Station, Va.: Storm drainage.....	-287,000
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D.C.: Patient visitor facility.....	-1,997,000
Laundry (deficiency).....	+2,705,000
Oakland Army Base, Calif.: Security lighting.....	-142,000
Fort Greely, Alaska: Automotive self-help garage.....	-429,000
National Missile Range, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Additional instrumentation and technical support facilities..	-849,000
Ennylabegan power addition.....	-475,000
Various, U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command (Overseas): Upgrade power (deficiency).....	+237,000
Various, Germany: Dependent school additions (deficiency).....	+607,000
Appropriation limitation.....	-7,500,000
Total.....	-60,506,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

The Committee has approved a total of \$608,467,000 for Military Construction for the Active Forces, and \$23,100,000 for the Reserve Forces.

For the Active Forces, the Committee allowance represents a reduction of \$76,933,000 in the budget estimate of \$685,400,000 and is \$90,637,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1973. A detailed tabulation by installation and states follows. Navy family housing is not included in the above figures but is presented in a subsequent portion of this report. A tabulation of the Committee action by Naval districts and special programs follows:

Naval district	DOD request	HAC	SAC
Inside the United States:			
1st Naval District.....	\$3, 184	\$2, 952	\$2, 952
3d Naval District.....	12, 695	6, 158	11, 564
4th Naval District.....	1, 130	180	180
Naval District, Washington, D.C.....	25, 740	17, 882	18, 182
5th Naval District.....	50, 358	46, 863	50, 263
6th Naval District.....	86, 022	65, 489	66, 930
8th Naval District.....	25, 623	25, 623	25, 623
9th Naval District.....	19, 908	15, 148	15, 148
11th Naval District.....	44, 272	43, 132	43, 132
12th Naval District.....	23, 001	17, 956	17, 956
13th Naval District.....	11, 073	6, 915	6, 915
14th Naval District.....	15, 694	14, 349	15, 694
Marine Corps.....	54, 844	53, 845	51, 019
Various locations:			
Trident facilities.....	118, 320	112, 320	112, 320
Pollution abatement—air.....	27, 636	27, 636	27, 636
Pollution abatement—water.....	60, 680	51, 112	51, 112
Total inside the United States.....	580, 180	507, 560	516, 626
Outside the United States:			
10th Naval District.....	2, 852	2, 852	14, 852
15th Naval District.....	0	0	0
Atlantic Ocean area.....	17, 478	17, 478	11, 386
European area.....	8, 192	10, 050	10, 050
Indian Ocean area.....	0	0	0
Pacific Ocean area.....	14, 903	10, 978	12, 458
Various locations:			
Pollution abatement—air.....	0	0	0
Pollution abatement—water.....	3, 995	3, 995	3, 995
Total outside the United States.....	47, 420	45, 353	52, 741
Classified programs.....	0	0	0
General support programs.....	627, 600	552, 913	569, 367
Urgent minor construction.....	15, 000	15, 000	15, 000
Planning and design.....	53, 800	53, 800	57, 800
Access roads.....	1, 000	1, 000	2, 000
Total continuing authorization.....	69, 800	69, 800	74, 800
Total obligational authority.....	697, 400	622, 713	644, 167
Reductions in total obligational authority.....	12, 000	35, 072	35, 700
New obligational authority.....	685, 400	587, 641	608, 467

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

The Committee has allowed \$2,952,000 for projects at Naval installations in the states of Maine and New Hampshire.

The significant projects approved are an operational trainer building project at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine which will provide facilities for training flight crews in the directional JEZEBEL Sonobuoy system; and one project for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire (Kittery, Maine) that will improve the operational capability of this shipyard. The project approved at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is an additional crane rail project.

No projects were denied funding by the House in this district.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district \$11,564,000 was approved for projects at Naval installations in the states of Connecticut and New Jersey.

The significant projects approved were a bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project for 1,322 men and an electrical tie and distribution line project at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut; an engineering building project at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, New London, Connecticut that will replace existing facilities and provide space for engineering and scientific personnel engaged in the research and development of Sonar and Accoustic Sensor systems; and a Military Sealift Command/Atlantic relocation project at the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey.

The Committee has restored two projects denied by the House. These projects are the engineering building in the amount of \$3,600,000 at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London, Connecticut and the Military Sealift Command/Atlantic relocation project at the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey.

The Committee believes the physical plant facilities for the development of sensors for submarine program should not limit the Navy's ability to keep pace with current sensor and related technology, which may be the case without the new engineering building. The relocation project was restored to provide the administrative spaces needed for relocating the Military Sealift Command from the Brooklyn Army Terminal to Bayonne, New Jersey.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The Committee approved \$180,000 for projects at Naval installations in the state of Pennsylvania. The project approved is a computer support facility at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. A primary substation expansion project at the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, which is a low priority project, was denied. This project was also denied by the House.

NAVAL DISTRICT WASHINGTON

In this district \$18,182,000 was approved for projects at Naval installations in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia.

In Maryland the projects approved include the Maury Hall rehabilitation project at the Naval Academy; an environmental health effects laboratory at the Medical Research Institute, Bethesda; and a fire protection system modifications project at the Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head. In Virginia, the two projects approved were: an amendment for the sewage treatment plant expansion project at the Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, and a hospital alterations project at the Naval Hospital, Quantico, Virginia.

In the Naval District Washington, the significant project approved was an electromagnetic test and analyses laboratory at the Naval Research Laboratory. This project will provide facilities to conduct basic research required to develop and evaluate counter measures against hostile weapons systems, such as the cruise missile.

At the Naval Academy, the Committee restored the \$300,000 reduction for the Maury Hall Rehabilitation project, since the reduced funding for this project could result in some spaces remaining unfinished and unusable. The Navy advises that all the spaces are required, therefore, if unfavorable bids were received for this project, the Navy could be in the position of having to request additional authorization and funding in a subsequent year. Based on recent trends in the construction industry, cost escalation will continue and the net result could be a more costly rehabilitation of Maury Hall.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The Committee approved \$50,263,000 for projects at Naval installations in the state of Virginia.

The significant projects approved are: an applied instruction building project at the Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, that will provide facilities to support the Combat Information Training Center being relocated from the Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia; a dispensary and dental clinic at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia that will provide a new facility to replace an existing substandard facility; and a helicopter maintenance hanger project at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, that will provide hangar space for on-board helicopter units and 37 additional units being transferred to the station from the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey. At the Naval Station, Norfolk, three significant projects approved are: a berthing pier project to provide a pier with cold iron utilities that will accommodate ships that are too large to use existing berthing spaces; an applied instruction building project that will provide instructional and administrative space for the Fleet Sonar School being relocated from the Naval Station, Key West, Florida; and a pier utilities project that will provide cold iron utilities to the nuclear submarine pier.

At the Naval Air Station, Oceana, an aircraft systems training building project was approved to provide a maintenance training facility and an addition to the flight training building to house equipment to train pilots and ground crews in the F-14 aircraft systems. At the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, four projects were approved. The machine shop project will alter and install an addition to the inside machine shop to provide consolidated, efficient work spaces. The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide 516 men with modern living spaces that meet current habitability standards;

and an enlisted men's dining facility project will provide a new consolidated messing facility and replace the existing temporary deteriorated facility. The remaining project, a utilities improvement project, will provide the fifth increment for upgrading existing utilities systems required for the overhaul and repair of ships. At the Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, the torpedo overhaul shop project will provide a facility for maintenance and operational support of the new MK-48 torpedo weapons system.

An amendment of \$3,400,000 was added by the Armed Services Committee for the FY 1972 land acquisition project at the Naval Station, Norfolk. This amendment was added to give the Navy authority to acquire leasehold interests of tenants and to pay appropriate resettlement and relocation costs to the tenants as authorized by Public Law 91-646, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. The Committee approved the \$3,400,000 in appropriations for this amendment.

The Committee approved the appropriations for this Amendment so that the Navy may proceed to properly compensate and relocate all the tenants at one time instead of on a piece meal basis as originally planned. It seems to the Committee that the intent of Public Law 91-646 was to properly compensate tenants, not only for their interests in the real property and improvement, but also for their relocation expenses. Any delay in providing for relocation will work a severe hardship on the numerous small businesses located on the land.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district \$66,930,000 was approved by the Committee for projects at Naval installations in the states of Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Several projects approved for this district are associated with the Navy's Medical Facilities improvement program. These projects are a medical/dental support facilities project at the Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola; a dispensary and dental clinic at the Naval Air Station, Whiting Field; a dispensary and dental clinic at the Naval Air Station, Meridian; and an addition to dispensary project at the Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina. Other significant projects approved in this district are: an intermediate maintenance facility at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field that will provide a maintenance facility principally for airborne electronics equipment for the S-3A aircraft; an aircraft final finish facility and utilities project at the Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville; a nuclear power training building at the Naval Training Center, Orlando; a systems development and test facility project at the Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City; an electronics warfare training building and bachelor enlisted quarters projects at the Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola; the second phase of the New Naval Home at Gulfport; and finally an applied instruction building at the Naval Air Station, Memphis. At the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, a land acquisition project in the amount of \$2,200,000 originally required only authorization, since it was planned to acquire the land by exchange through the excessing of approximately 142 acres in the Jacksonville area. Subsequent to the submission of the project to the Congress, it was determined that the \$2,800,000 in authorization would be required.

The Committee has added funding in the amount of \$2,400,000 to permit acquisition of 365 acres of land at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, needed to forestall possible residential development which could lead to impairment of flying activity. Navy subsequently advised that an exchange cannot be accomplished in view of a claim by the Corps of Engineers to acquire the bulk of the proposed trade-off land for dumping of spoils dredged from Jacksonville harbor.

The Committee's decision to provide funds for an outright cash purchase is given in the interest of protecting a substantial investment in the Naval Air Station, but with reservations as to future Defense plans for the lands previously proposed for exchange. It is not clear whether the proposed dumping of dredge spoils is even viable in view of possible economic or ecological damage to land which appears to have a relatively high current market value.

The Committee desires that the feasibility of acquisition through full or partial exchange be restudied, and that the consent of the Committee be obtained prior to taking contractual action to acquire the land contiguous to the Air Station or otherwise disposing of the land originally proposed for exchange.

The Armed Services Committee during their deliberations on the authorization bill added two projects because they believed the requirements for the projects warranted their inclusion in this year's bill. The Committee approved appropriations for both projects and for one restoration of damaged facilities project at the Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, GA., as shown in the following tabulation:

Installation/project:	[In thousands]	<i>Amount</i>
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., land acquisition.....		\$2, 400
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., outlying fields.....		1, 400
Naval Communication Training Center, Pensacola, Fla., petty officers mess.....		831
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga., commissary store restoration.....		120
Total.....		4, 751

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district \$25,623,000 was approved at Naval installations in the states of Louisiana and Texas.

The significant projects approved were a nursing unit addition project at the Naval Hospital, New Orleans which will provide an addition of 150 beds to increase the capacity of the 100 bed hospital authorized in FY 1973. At the Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana four projects were approved. These projects will provide an administrative complex for consolidating in New Orleans the following organizations: Personnel Management Information Center, Naval Reserve Personnel Center, and Enlisted Personnel Distribution Offices. A project for an Armed Forces Examination and Entrance Station will provide administrative spaces for offices that will move from downtown New Orleans. Modern living quarters with mess for 211 men will be provided under the bachelor enlisted quarters project. Parking spaces for personnel working at this activity will be provided by a project for an employees parking building. Similar training buildings and dispensary/dental clinic projects will be provided at the

Naval Air Stations, Chase Field and Kingsville. A flight training building project will provide space to house new flight simulator equipment capable of simulating six different types of motion which enables it to provide very realistic simulation of an aircraft flight environment. The dispensary and dental clinic projects will replace existing facilities with modern clinics.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

The Committee approved \$15,148,000 for projects at the Naval Complex in the state of Illinois.

The significant projects approved are a hospital project to modernize and upgrade existing hospital utilities to the current National Fire Protection Association regulations; a dispensary and dental clinic project to provide a consolidated medical care facility to replace the existing dispersed deteriorated World War II facilities; a medical/dental processing facility to replace the existing substandard facility, and a Machinist/Boilerman instruction building project to provide classroom space for training associated with 1200 pounds per square inch (PSI) propulsion plants.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district, \$43,132,000 was approved for projects at Naval installations in the state of California.

The significant projects approved in this district are discussed in the following paragraphs.

At the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, a service group building project was approved to accommodate and consolidate the temporary service, rigger, mill and joiner, plastic and pattern shops and the sail loft. All of the shops require special building configuration. These configurations include high bay spaces with bridge cranes, sawdust and plastic dust collection and exhaust systems.

At the Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, two projects were approved. One project will provide an applied instruction building for conducting operational and maintenance training for the E-2 airborne early warning aircraft being transferred from the Naval Air Station, North Island. The second project, an avionics shop addition, will provide a facility for intermediate level maintenance of the airborne early warning aircraft.

At the Naval Air Station, North Island, the Committee approved appropriations for an avionics facility authorized in FY 1973. The avionics facility will provide space for the maintenance of electronic equipment and sensors on the aircraft now supported and on the new, even more complex S-3A, which is scheduled for Fleet introduction in March 1974.

The Committee also approved an applied instruction building project at the Naval Air Station, North Island, California to provide an addition to the existing training building for Light Airborne Multi-Purpose Systems (LAMPS) operational flight trainer and modifications to the existing building to accommodate helicopter operational and maintenance trainers.

At the Naval Air Rework Facility located at the Naval Air Station, North Island, a maintenance hanger project was approved to provide an addition to the E-2 rework hangar to accommodate the increase workload which has been generated by the more complex electronic systems installed in the E-2 aircraft. The Naval Air Station, North Island will become the homeport for all West Coast rotary wing aircraft squadrons when the transfer of all helicopter activities from the Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach has been completed.

An electronics development and test laboratory project was approved to provide a controlled electronics environment with electromagnetic shielding for integration and testing of command control, communications, and surveillance systems at the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego.

Two projects were approved at the Naval Station, San Diego, California. The berthing pier project will provide additional berthing space required to accommodate ships being relocated from the Naval Station, Long Beach. The pier utilities project will provide "cold iron" utilities and structural repairs to Pier 5.

At the Naval Training Center, San Diego a bachelor enlisted quarters project was approved to provide modern living quarters for 504 men.

At the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, a steam distribution project was approved to provide steam distribution lines to berthing piers from the new steam plant approved in FY 1973. This will permit more ships to go "cold iron."

A bachelor enlisted quarters project for 468 men was approved at the Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego and a pier utilities project to provide "cold iron" utilities to two piers being used by submarine tenders and attack submarines.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

For projects at Naval installations in the state of California, the Committee approved \$17,956,000.

Only the significant projects approved in this district will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

A pier utilities project was approved at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, to provide a final segment of a program to supply all berthing piers with complete utilities from shore facilities.

At the Naval Air Station, Lemoore a dental clinic project was approved to provide a new larger facility in the operational area which will permit existing space in the hospital to be converted to hospital usage.

A hospital alterations project was approved at the Naval Hospital, Oakland to provide increased electrical power and air conditioning to patient care areas.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district, \$6,915,000 was approved for projects at Naval installations in the states of Alaska and Washington.

At the Naval Complex, Adak, Alaska a bachelor enlisted quarters projects was approved to provide modern living spaces for 136 men.

An electrical distribution system project to upgrade and replace the antiquated and under sized existing system was approved along with a crane track extension project at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

\$15,694,000 was approved for projects at Naval installations in the state of Hawaii.

A summary of the requirements for the significant projects approved in this district will be provided in the following paragraphs.

At the Naval Air Station, Barbers Point a dispensary and dental clinic was approved to replace the existing functionally inadequate facility.

A perimeter fence and security culverts project was approved at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu to improve and complete existing security features which only provide one-half of the fencing and culverts needed.

An evaluation center project at the Naval Station, Ford Island was approved to provide facilities to expand the center to accommodate new equipment that will increase the capability of the Anti-Submarine Warfare System.

A bachelor enlisted quarters project was approved to modernize a quarters and mess for 474 men at the Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor.

At the Naval Communications Station, Honolulu a satellite communication terminal project was approved to provide facilities for programmed Phase II Satellite Communication System. At the same station a VLF antenna modifications project was approved to correct deficiencies in the antenna which require a reduction in operating power and a lowering of the signal strength to an unacceptable level.

The Committee restored the enlisted men's dining facility at the Naval Station, Pearl Harbor in the amount of \$1,345,000. A study of the requirement for this project shows that the present facility had several years ago outlived its useful life on the basis of sanitary conditions, esthetics and economics. The building is also remotely located from the bachelor enlisted quarters it serves which exposes personnel to the hazards of walking along and across a busy industrial roadway that serves the harbor area. On the basis of these requirements, the Committee restored the project.

MARINE CORPS

The Committee has approved \$51,019,000 for Marine Corps installations in the states of Arizona, California, Georgia, Hawaii, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

The Marine Corps program continues a major effort to satisfy deficiencies in Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and in other personnel support facilities, such as a gymnasium and commissary. The remainder of the Marine Corps program includes utilities projects, air/ground operational facilities, a combat training complex, an applied instruction facility and an administrative facility at the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. This administrative

facility will allow relocation of the Inventory Control Point from the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Albany, Georgia.

The Committee restored funding for the commissary project at the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, AZ in the amount of \$999,000. The Marine Corps advises that they will not be able to maintain a viable commissary modernization program within the limited dollars generated by commissary profit reserves and also accomplish this project from those reserves.

The committee denied funding in the amount of \$3,825,000 for the dispensary at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, without prejudice to a future program.

TRIDENT FACILITIES—UNITED STATES

The Committee approved \$112,320,000 for the various locations TRIDENT Facilities—United States project, which is the same amount appropriated by the House. This is a \$6 million reduction from the amount authorized for this project, but a reduction acceptable to the Navy. The Navy advised that this reduction could be absorbed this year in the land acquisition and utilities areas. A detailed discussion of the requirement and the facilities to be constructed under this project were provided earlier under the general section of the report.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Inside the United States

The Committee approved \$78,748,000 for two projects located inside the United States.

Approved for air pollution abatement was \$27,636,000 and for water pollution abatement \$51,112,000.

A detailed description of the facilities to be provided under the water and air pollution abatement projects was provided in the general section of this report.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

In this district the Committee approved \$14,852,000 for projects at one Naval Complex and one Naval installation in Puerto Rico, the West Indies. At the Naval Complex, Puerto Rico, two projects were approved. An enlisted men's dining facility was approved to provide a new messing facility to replace the obsolete deteriorated mess hall at the Naval Station Roosevelt Roads. At the Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca an enlisted men's dining facility improvement project was approved to replace a 32 year old overcrowded and obsolete facility. At the Naval Facility, Grand Turk West Indies an electric power and water project was approved to replace obsolete generators, and a desalination plant with an efficient electric power and water plant.

In order to permit the Navy to proceed with the relocation of weapons ranges from Culebra, an appropriation of \$12,000,000 was provided to match the amount authorized for the Relocation of the Weapons Ranges from Culebra project at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range, Naval Complex, Puerto Rico.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

In this area the Committee approved \$11,386,000 for projects at Naval installations in Bermuda, and Cuba.

An underwater weapons compound project and a power and water plant expansion project were approved at the Naval Air Station, Bermuda. Three projects were approved for the Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. At the Naval Hospital, an air conditioning project was approved to relieve patient discomfort by modernizing and partially replacing the existing air conditioning system. An electrical generating plant project was approved to provide a new turbine boiler and a salt water conversion unit to increase power production to meet anticipated power demands and to increase water production to eliminate the problems of water rationing. An electrical substations project was approved to increase power production to meet anticipated growth and relieve current overloading of the existing system during peak load (summer months). A bachelor enlisted quarters project and a bachelor officer's quarters project were deferred in the amounts of \$2,834,000 and \$3,258,000, respectively at the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland. These projects were deferred pending the outcome of a new base rights agreement to be negotiated between the United States Government and the Icelandic Government.

No projects were denied funding in this district by the House.

EUROPEAN AREA

The Committee approved for this area \$10,050,000 for projects at Naval installations in Greece, Italy, Scotland, and Spain.

For the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, the four projects approved are: an aircraft parking apron to provide space for 5 P-3 patrol planes and for transient carrier based aircraft; an air passenger/cargo terminal, a general warehouse and an enlisted men's club.

Six projects were approved at the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy. A photographic building was approved to support the increased level of aerial photo missions. The other projects approved are: a public works shop stores addition, a gymnasium, an officers' Club, a Chief Petty Officers club, and utilities systems improvements to provide utilities to the administrative area.

A bachelor enlisted quarters project was approved to provide a new facility to relieve a 50% deficiency in space at the Naval Security Group Activity Edzell, Scotland, where community support is almost non-existent. At the Naval Station, Rota, Spain, a tactical support center project was approved to provide an operational link between the P-3C ASW Aircraft and shore ASW operations.

The House approved the projects for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece and the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy,

but indicated that a portion of several projects should be funded from savings or by the cancellation of lower priority projects as shown below:

	Project amount	Amount to be funded from savings
Naval detachment, Souda Bay, Greece:		
Aircraft parking apron.....	\$2,666	\$2,666
Air passenger cargo terminal.....	554	277
General warehouse.....	531	266
Naval air facility, Signoella, Italy: Photographic building.....	328	164

The reduction was made by the House on the basis that the Navy should have been alert to these needs many years ago and should have programmed these facilities in a NATO Infrastructure Slice program. The Committee does not believe the Navy could have improved substantially on the management of the NATO eligible projects, therefore full funding has been provided for these projects.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

In this area, the Committee approved \$12,458,000 for projects at one Naval installation and two Naval Complexes in Australia, the Marianna Islands, and the Republic of the Philippines.

For the Naval Complex, Guam, the significant projects approved are: a mine assembly facility project at the Naval Magazine Guam that will provide a mine assembly maintenance and inert parts storage compound for processing a large percentage of mines in the Pacific area; a wharf utilities project that will provide dockside utilities at the Naval Station, Guam for homeported ships to allow the ships to shut down their engineering plants; and at the Naval Public Works Center the Finegayan telephone exchange project to provide a facility to house a new 1,000-line dial control office. Also at the Public Works Center, a water system improvements project was approved to increase the production of treated water and to improve the existing distribution system to accommodate increasing user demands.

Two projects were approved for the Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines. A tactical support center project at the Naval Air Station, Cubi Point will provide facilities to operationally link the P-3C ASW aircraft with shore based ASW operations. A utilities improvements project at the Navy Public Works Center will replace exposed electrical pier connections with modern connections to eliminate safety hazards.

The Committee restored the funding for the theater at the Naval Complex (Naval Station), Guam in the amount of \$1,480,000. The Committee believes the Navy has carefully examined its requirements for theaters on Guam and that this theater is needed to adequately serve the personnel of the Naval Station.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Outside the United States

Water pollution abatement projects located outside the United States were approved in the amount of \$3,995,000. These projects will

provide: A sewage treatment plant expansion at the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico; a ship waste water collection ashore system and a water plant backwash control facility at the Navy Public Works Center, Guam.

CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS

The Committee approved \$74,800,000 for continuing authorizations broken down as follows:

	<i>Amount</i>
Access roads	\$2, 000, 000
Planning and design	57, 800, 000
Urgent minor construction	15, 000, 000

The amounts approved for access roads and planning and design are \$1,000,000 greater and \$4,000,000 greater, respectively than the amounts originally requested.

The basis for the increases for access roads and planning and design have been addressed in the general portion of this report.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

A total of \$18.9 million in FY 1974 appropriations has been provided for the construction of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve facilities. This amount excludes \$2.6 million added by the House to reimburse the Naval Reserve for costs associated with the relocation of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Headquarters. This amount was denied until the Navy is able to provide the Committee with an explanation of the original and current construction costs for this relocation.

The appropriation will provide nine Reserve Center in 7 states, 6 Naval Air Reserve operational facilities, and 4 ship, logistics, and personnel support facilities. In addition, \$1.4 million is provided for necessary design and planning and essential minor construction requirements.

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Theater...	—\$232, 000
Naval Support Activity, Brooklyn, N. Y.:	
Relocate telephone switchboard.....	—75, 000
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization.....	—1, 056, 000
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Penn.: Electronics equipment facility.....	—735, 000
Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia:	
Acoustic research facility.....	—740, 000
Naval Station, Annapolis, Md.: Bulkhead replacement.....	—1, 080, 000
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.:	
Navy Exchange retail store.....	—1, 764, 000
Roads.....	—1, 546, 000
Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Md.: VLF antenna modifications.....	—1, 300, 000
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.: Electromagnetic propagation facility.....	—680, 000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Hypervelocity wind tunnel.....	—448, 000
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.: Electronics Building.....	—139, 000
Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.:	
Vehicle parking area.....	—310, 000
Land acquisition.....	+3, 400, 000
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.: Utilities.....	—576, 000
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, dispensary addition.....	—107, 000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Land acquisition.....	+2, 400, 000
Naval Hospital, Orlando, Fla.: Hospital replacement.....	—20, 981, 000
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla.:	
Dental clinic.....	—1, 481, 000
Basic electricity and electronics training building.....	—1, 274, 000
Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Fla.: Petty officers mess.....	+831, 000
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Outlying fields.....	+1, 400, 000
Naval Complex, Great Lakes, Ill.: Naval Training Center bachelor enlisted quarters.....	—4, 760, 000
Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Applied instruction building (reduction).....	—419, 000
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Calif.: Bachelor enlisted quarters with mess.....	—721, 000
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Naval Air Rework Facility avionics building environmental control.....	—1, 409, 000
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif.:	
Taxiway overlay.....	—2, 115, 000
Operational trainer building addition.....	—430, 000
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Dry dock support facility.....	—250, 000
Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, Calif.: Dispensary and dental clinic.....	—641, 000
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.: Electronic shop alterations.....	—200, 000
Naval Complex, Adak, Alaska: Naval Station runway and taxiway overlay.....	—4, 158, 000
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Calif.: Ship waste water collection ashore.....	—3, 700, 000

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS—continued

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii: Municipal sewer connection facility-----	—\$5, 868, 000
Navy Support Office, Athens, Greece: Aircraft support facilities...	+1, 948, 000
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland: Bachelor enlisted quarters-----	—90, 000
Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines:	
Naval Station bachelor enlisted quarters modernization.....	—1, 411, 000
Naval Station dependent school expansion-----	—1, 034, 000
Appropriation limitation-----	—7, 500, 000
Sec. 204-----	+12, 000, 000
Total-----	—47, 251, 000

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

The Committee has approved a total of \$291,198,000 for military construction, of which \$30,000,000 is for the reserve forces. The Committee allowance represents a reduction of \$30,702,000 in the budget estimate of \$321,900,000 and is \$2,546,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1973. A detailed tabulation, by installations and States is detailed later in this report. Air Force family housing is not included in the above figures and is presented in a subsequent portion of this report. A tabulation of the Committee action by major Air Force command and special programs follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Senate action
Inside the United States:			
Aerospace defense command.....	8,794	8,863	8,863
Air Force communications service.....	3,963	3,963	3,963
Air Force logistics command.....	60,934	44,430	46,074
Air Force systems command.....	9,062	8,120	8,582
Air training command.....	56,282	54,089	54,089
Air University.....	5,462	0	0
Alaskan air command.....	8,658	8,658	8,658
Headquarters command, USAF.....	18,435	4,639	18,139
Military airlift command.....	12,416	9,709	9,709
Pacific air forces.....	7,331	7,331	7,331
Strategic air command.....	25,738	23,134	21,847
Tactical air command.....	17,703	12,589	16,795
U.S. Air Force Academy.....	645	483	483
Air Force security service.....	0	6,115	6,115
Pollution abatement.....	9,070	9,070	9,070
Air installation compatible use zones.....	2,000	0	0
Total, inside United States.....	246,493	201,193	219,718
Outside the United States:			
Aerospace defense command.....	1,355	1,355	0
Pacific air forces.....	11,788	7,950	7,950
U.S. Air Forces in Europe.....	15,925	15,776	17,102
U.S. Air Forces southern command.....	1,038	927	927
U.S. Air Force security service.....	221	221	221
Pollution abatement.....	750	750	750
Worldwide communications.....	330	330	330
Total, outside United States.....	31,407	27,309	27,280
Classified (sec. 302): Radar support facility, various worldwide.....	1,000	0	1,000
General support programs:			
Planning and design.....	18,000	18,000	18,000
Minor construction.....	15,000	15,000	15,000
Access roads.....	0	0	2,000
Total, general appropriation.....	33,000	33,000	35,000
Grant total program.....	311,900	261,502	282,998
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program.....	20,000	21,800	21,800
Budget authority.....	291,900	239,702	261,198

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

The Committee is in agreement with House action to approve \$8,863,000 for eight line items at two installations.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

The Committee is in agreement with House action to approve \$3,963,000 for two line items at one installation.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The Committee has restored \$1,887,000 for the construction of an Aircraft Engine Component Research Facility at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. This provides funding for an important aircraft engine research facility by modification and alteration to an existing structure at more than \$10 million less than it would take to locate the facility elsewhere. There is no other facility in the free world in which this important research can be conducted. The Committee also deleted a project for the alteration of a Precision Measurement Facility at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, in the amount of \$243,000. The actions result in a total Committee approval of \$46,074,000 for this command.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Committee has restored \$462,000 for the construction of an Automotive Maintenance Facility at Kodiak, Alaska, making a total program for this command in the amount of \$8,582,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Funds in the amount of \$54,089,000 have been approved for this command. This is in agreement with House action.

AIR UNIVERSITY

The Committee is in agreement with House action to defer the two line items requested for this command.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Funds in the amount of \$8,658,000 have been approved for this command. This is in agreement with House action.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, USAF

The Committee has approved a program of \$18,139,000 for this command. This is \$13,500,000 in excess of House action and results from the restoration of funds to construct Special Aircraft Support Facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. This will provide facilities necessary to support Boeing 747 aircraft that have been approved for Air Force procurement.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The Committee has approved funds in the amount of \$9,709,000 for this command. This agrees with House action.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Funds in the amount of \$7,331,000 have been approved for this command. This is in agreement with House action.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The Committee has approved \$21,747,000 for this command that is \$1,387,000 less than House approvals. This results from the funding of \$213,000 to enable completion of a WAF dormitory at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, and the deferral of dormitory construction at Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, in the amount of \$1,500,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Funds for this command have been approved in the amount of \$16,795,000 or \$4,206,000 more than that approved by the House. This results from restorations by the Committee of \$2,273,000 for a commissary at Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, and \$1,933,000 for the construction of a Base Personnel Office at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Funds in the amount of \$483,000 have been approved for this command. This is in agreement with House action.

U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

The Committee is in agreement with House action in approving a program of \$6,115,000 for this command.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The Committee has approved funds in the amount of \$9,070,000 for this program. This is in agreement with House action.

AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

The Committee recognizes the need for this program but feels that Air Force efforts to achieve program objectives through community zoning or land exchanges in the past fiscal year can be carried into the future. This is in agreement with action by the House Armed Services Committee.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The Committee has denied funding for three projects at Keflavik, Iceland, thereby reducing the program for this command (overseas) to zero. This action is considered necessary due to the uncertainty of the continuation of U.S. base rights in Iceland.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (OVERSEAS)

The Committee approved \$7,950,000 for the overseas area of this command and thereby agrees with House action.

U.S. AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The Committee has approved funds in the amount of \$17,102,000 for this command or \$1,326,000 in excess of House action. This results from committee action to restore funds to fully finance deficiency fund-

ing for Air Force projects in Germany that have been negatively affected by currency revaluations and severe cost inflation in Germany.

U.S. AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

For this command, the Committee has approved funding in the amount of \$927,000. This is in agreement with House action.

U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICES (OVERSEAS)

The Committee has approved funds for this command in the amount of \$221,000. This agrees with House action.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT (OVERSEAS)

The Committee agrees with House action in approving the Air Force request of \$750,000 for this program.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNICATIONS

The Air Force request of \$330,000 to provide for expansion of Technical Control Facilities has been approved by the Committee in consonance with House action.

CLASSIFIED

The Committee has restored \$1,000,000 to finance facilities to support a phased array radar system.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION

Committee approval is given for an appropriation of \$35,000,000 for the continuing authorization requested. The program by Committee recognition of an urgent need for access road construction at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, provides \$2,000,000 not requested by the Air Force. Details of the appropriation are:

Planning and design-----	\$18, 000, 000
Minor construction-----	15, 000, 000
Access roads-----	2, 000, 000
Total-----	35, 000, 000

PRIOR YEAR FUNDS UNOBLIGATED

The Committee is in agreement with House action to reduce the appropriation request of the Air Force by \$21,800,000 as opposed to an Air Force offer of \$20,000,000. The increase represents a reduction of \$1,800,000 of unobligated funds originally appropriated for use in Southeast Asia.

AIR FORCE (AIR NATIONAL GUARD)

The Air National Guard fiscal year 1974 Military Construction Appropriation request of \$20.0 million reflects Air Force recognition of the Committee's fiscal year 1973 concern for expanded sums to support the increasing need for adequate Reserve forces facilities in view of the total force policy.

The fiscal year 1974 appropriation will enable the Air National Guard to construct 35 essential operational, maintenance, and training facilities in 23 states as well as 13 other vital aircraft arresting barrier and power check pad facilities at various locations. In addition, \$4.0 million is provided to support necessary planning and design as well as essential minor construction requirements.

AIR FORCE (AIR FORCE RESERVE)

In response to the continuing requirement for adequate reserve facilities to support the changing missions of its reserve components under the Total Force Policy, the Air Force has requested a fiscal year 1974 Air Force Reserve appropriation of \$10.0 million. This amount will provide 32 operational, maintenance, and training facilities in 15 states. In addition, this appropriation provides \$1.0 million to support necessary planning and essential minor construction requirements.

Though this request is somewhat smaller than those of the other reserve components, it is considered adequate.

AUTHORIZATION ACTIONS

A summary of the additions and deletions made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation follows:

Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla. :	
Theater -----	-\$751, 000
Gymnasium -----	+820, 000
Hill Air Force Base, Utah :	
Ballistic missile processing support facility -----	-3, 000, 000
Advanced logistics system utility support -----	-625, 000
McClellan Air Force Base, Calif. : Advanced logistics system utility support -----	
	-599, 000
Robins Air Force Base, Ga. : Depot aircraft run-up facility -----	
	-240, 000
Tinker Air Force Base, Okla. : Add to and alter composite medical facility -----	
	-3, 879, 000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio :	
Aircraft fuels and lubricants laboratory -----	-4, 857, 000
Airmen dormitories -----	-1, 117, 000
Advanced logistics system utility support -----	-300, 000
-----	-480, 000
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass. : Add to and alter base roads -----	
	+1, 200, 000
Keesler Air Force Base, Miss. : Runway extension -----	
	-1, 260, 000
Lowry Air Force Base, Colo. : Airmen open mess -----	
	-1, 683, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Calif. : Base personnel office -----	
	-450, 000
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz. : Add to and alter chapel center -----	
	-562, 000
Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. :	
Add to and alter NCO academic facility (Gunter) -----	-4, 900, 000
Add to and alter composite medical facility -----	
Andrews Air Force Base, Md. : Add to and alter air passenger terminal -----	
	-296, 000
Altus Air Force Base, Okla. : Base flight operations facility -----	
	-692, 000
Dover Air Force Base, Del. : Base facilities maintenance complex -----	
	-829, 000
McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. : Air-condition base personnel office -----	
	-162, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Calif. : Aircraft hydrant refueling system -----	
	-1, 024, 000
Barksdale Air Force Base, La. : Air-condition base headquarters facility -----	
	-543, 000
Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark. : Security police facility -----	
	-140, 000
Grissom Air Force Base, Ind. : Alter airmen dormitories -----	
	-1, 600, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont. : Dormitory facilities -----	
	+213, 000
Various : Aircraft instrument landing facilities (reduction) -----	
	-321, 000
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex. : Weapons guidance test facility -----	
	-908, 000
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado : Add to and alter base telephone exchange facility -----	
	-162, 000
Air Installation Compatible Use Zones : Land -----	
	-2, 000, 000
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas : Hospital -----	
	+6, 115, 000
Clark Air Base, Philippine Islands : Noncommissioned officers open mess -----	
	-2, 000, 000
Kunsan Air Base, Korea : Airmen dormitories -----	
	-1, 888, 000
Ramstein Air Base, Germany : Taxiway shoulder pavement -----	
	-465, 000
Various, Germany : -----	
	+7, 333, 000
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom :	
Aircraft fueling support facility -----	-166, 000
Composite medical facility -----	-5, 525, 000
Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone : Air-condition chapel center -----	
	-111, 000
Total -----	
	-27, 804, 000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

GENERAL STATEMENT

For the Department of Defense Agencies, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,000,000. This is \$7,100,000 below the budget estimate of \$19,100,000 and is \$12,000,000 above the House allowance.

The program breakdown is as follows: Defense Nuclear Agency, \$574,000; Defense Supply Agency, \$8,370,000; National Security Agency, \$8,156,000; General Support Programs, \$2,000,000.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

The budget request for "Military Construction, Defense Agencies" amounted to \$19,100,000. The committee has approved \$12,000,000. This is a reduction of \$7,100,000 for fiscal year 1974 and is \$24,704,000 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Approved by committee
Inside United States:			
Defense Nuclear Agency.....	574	574	574
Defense Supply Agency.....	8,370	8,370	8,370
National Security Agency.....	8,156	4,627	8,156
Total.....	17,100	13,571	17,100
General support programs:			
DOD emergency construction.....	30,000	30,000	30,000
Planning.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Minor construction.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, general support.....	32,000	32,000	32,000
Grand total, programs.....	49,100	45,571	49,100
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 programs.....	30,000	45,571	37,100
Budget authority requested.....	19,100	0	12,000

The fiscal year 1974 budget submitted to Congress requested a program of \$49,100,000 and an appropriation of \$19,100,000. In structuring this program, the Department of Defense indicated a program, or anticipated requirement, in the amount of \$30,000,000 for projects which would qualify for funding under DOD emergency construction authority. The Department further indicated that no additional funds were required for this purpose on the basis that unobligated prior year funds were considered adequate to finance fiscal year 1974 requirements. The unobligated balance in the Secretary's emergency fund totaled \$54,429,500 as of June 30, 1973.

The program approved by the Committee, as tabulated above, provides for essential facilities of the agencies listed. The Committee's

allowance of \$12,000,000 is the maximum possible in view of action by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees which gave their approval for the full program requested for the Agencies, but made a general reduction of \$7,100,000 in the authorization for appropriation. This action has the effect of applying additional prior year unobligated emergency construction funds to partially finance the fiscal year 1974 program.

The House has recommended a further reduction of \$12,000,000, which deletes funding in the amount of \$3,529,000 for a logistic support facility at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, and provides that the balance of the program be financed entirely from unobligated prior year funds. The Committee does not agree with the House action, and recommends approval of the Defense Agencies program as submitted, subject only to funding constraints resulting from the Armed Service Committee's actions.

FAMILY HOUSING

The Committee has approved \$1,188,539,000 in new appropriated funds for the fiscal year 1974 military family housing program. This amount comprises approximately 44 percent of the entire funds appropriated in this bill and is \$93,128,000 lower than the revised Defense budget request for family housing.

To provide maintenance and operation funds for defense housing, approval has been given in the authorized amount of \$622,913,000 to maintain and operate an estimated 380,006 housing units during fiscal year 1974. In addition, the Committee has approved \$44,703,000 for leasing of 10,000 domestic and 7,262 foreign family housing units for assignment as public quarters.

The Committee has recommended a \$381,603,000 family housing construction program. The approved program will provide for the construction of 10,541 new permanent units, which is 1,147 units less than requested. New construction approved includes 5,369 units at 12 Army installations, 3,460 units at 11 Navy and Marine Corps bases, 1,700 units at 8 Air Force bases and 12 units for the Defense Intelligence Agency. The Committee did not approve the 150 unit Navy project authorized for construction at Iceland because of questions remaining in the need for the project. A total of \$309,733,000 is required for the approved new construction program. Other construction approved by the Committee includes \$5,700,000 for mobile home facilities; \$240,000 for acquisition and connection of a utility system serving Wherry housing, \$62,510,000 for improvements to family quarters, \$2,720,000 for minor construction and \$700,000 for planning. The Committee recommends that \$361,746,000 in new appropriations be provided for this construction program and that the balance of the program amounting to \$19,857,000 be financed from savings. Savings are available in funds appropriated in prior years but not needed because of project cancellations due to base closures, realignments or other changes in requirements. Sufficient funds remain to provide adequate construction for the valid fiscal year 1972 and 1973 housing projects.

The funding allowed by the Committee for debt payment is the budget estimate of \$159,177,000. This includes \$100,167,000 for the payment of debt principal amount owed on Capehart, Wherry, and Commodity Credit financed housing. In addition, \$53,024,000 is approved for the payment of interest on mortgage indebtedness on Capehart and Wherry housing and for other expenses relating to the construction and acquisition of these houses in prior years. The Committee approved \$5,986,000 for payment to the Federal Housing Administration, for premiums on Capehart and Wherry housing mortgage insurance and for the payment of premiums on insurance provided by the FHA for mortgages assumed by active military personnel for houses purchased by them.

With respect to the inadequate quarters legislations, section 508 of Public Law 92-545, which authorized the designation as inadequate of not more than 20,000 family housing units, in addition to inadequate

units already in the inventory, Defense reported that the Services and the Defense Supply Agency had designated 19,282 units as inadequate as of July 1, 1973 and had placed them on a rental basis at fair rental values, not to exceed 75% of the occupant's Basic Allowance for Quarters.

The Family Housing Management Account continues to prove itself an effective tool of management. Since the account was established and through Fiscal Year 1973 nearly \$7.8 billion has been made available for family housing; \$1.8 billion for construction (74,000 units); \$4.2 billion for operation and maintenance; and \$1.8 billion for debt payment. The Committee notes that operation and maintenance costs have increased in recent years, not only because of increased labor and material costs and the aging of the inventory, but because of the current efforts to reduce the significant backlog of deferred maintenance. Continuation of business-like management principles will assure the Committee and Defense an excellent means of gauging future requirements and assessing proposals for providing members of the Armed Forces with comfortable, adequate and economic housing for their families.

Defense requested additional legislation to complete a land exchange on Oahu, Hawaii. Public Law 91-564, authorized the conveyance of land at Fort Ruger, Hawaii to that State in exchange for land adjacent to the Tripler Army Hospital as a site for family housing. Subsequent evaluation determined that development of the land near Tripler was too costly and Defense requested that the legislation be changed to provide for the State to furnish, either in facilities and services or money, or a combination of them, a sum equal to the appraised fair market value of the Fort Ruger property to be available for site preparation for military family housing at the Defense-owned Aliamanu Military Reservation, Oahu, Hawaii.

The base realignments announced April 17, 1973 are of such magnitude that resources in the Homeowners Assistance Fund will be insufficient to take care of the requirements of the Homeowners Assistance Program in Fiscal Year 1974. Accordingly, Defense requested an additional \$7 million in appropriations for the Program. Defense also requested a modest expansion of the Program to cover certain personnel not now covered by the program because of statutory technicalities, but who suffer the same losses in disposing of their homes as the personnel covered by the program at the same installation.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

Defense submitted a revised budget request of \$7,000,000 in new funds for the homeowners assistance program. The program provides assistance to qualified military and civilian homeowners by reducing their losses incident to disposal of their homes when a military installation is closed or the scope of its operations is reduced.

The revised budget request was submitted to obtain financing for the FY 1974 assistance costs expected to result from the April 1973 base closure announcement. These costs were not reflected in the January 1973 budget submittal. The Committee has approved the revised request for funds in the amount of \$7,000,000. Also, spending of agency debt receipts, authorized in permanent legislation, will provide an additional \$17,443,000.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
Inside United States:				
1st Army.....	66,891	43,750	43,750	-----
3d Army.....	153,476	146,493	144,533	-----
5th Army.....	155,697	143,713	146,452	-----
6th Army.....	37,745	34,640	34,640	-----
U.S. Army Materiel Command.....	58,649	42,995	43,451	-----
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command.....	8,226	8,226	8,226	-----
U.S. Army Military Academy.....	30,145	5,145	25,145	-----
Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service.....	5,716	1,971	4,171	-----
Army Medical Department.....	12,827	13,535	13,535	-----
U.S. Army, Alaska.....	8,344	7,915	7,915	-----
USARPAC, Hawaii.....	10,825	9,592	10,825	-----
Corps of Engineers.....	597	0	597	-----
U.S. Army Security Agency.....	287	0	0	-----
Air pollution abatement.....	7,295	6,900	7,295	-----
Water pollution abatement.....	7,099	7,099	7,099	-----
Classified various locations.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	-----
Total inside United States.....	566,819	474,974	500,634	-----
Outside United States:				
U.S. Army Southern Command.....	8,095	8,095	8,095	-----
USAREUR, Germany.....	12,517	13,124	13,124	-----
USAREUR, Infrastructure.....	¹ 60,000	² 95,650	² 75,650	-----
U.S. Army Security Agency.....	1,434	1,434	1,434	-----
U.S. Army Pacific.....	1,568	1,568	1,568	-----
Kwajalein Missile Range.....	2,353	1,029	1,029	-----
U.S. Army Strategic Communications Command.....	2,097	2,334	2,334	-----
Puerto Rico.....	517	517	517	-----
Total outside United States.....	¹ 88,581	² 123,751	² 103,751	-----
General support programs:				
Minor construction.....	12,500	15,000	15,000	-----
Planning.....	39,000	39,000	39,000	-----
Access roads.....			2,000	-----
Total general authorization.....	51,500	54,000	56,000	-----
Grand total program.....	¹ 706,900	² 652,725	² 660,385	-----
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program.....	42,000	² 101,150	² 92,650	-----
Budget authority.....	¹ 664,900	² 551,575	² 567,735	-----

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in budget amendment.

² Reflects \$35,650,000 unobligated prior year Safeguard funds transferred to NATO Infrastructure toward meeting cost of dollar devaluations.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
Inside United States:				
1st Naval District	3,184	2,952	2,952	
3rd Naval District	12,695	6,158	11,564	
4th Naval District	1,130	180	180	
Naval District, Washington, D.C.	25,740	17,882	18,182	
5th Naval District	50,358	46,863	50,263	
6th Naval District	86,022	65,489	66,930	
8th Naval District	25,623	25,623	25,623	
9th Naval District	19,908	15,148	15,148	
11th Naval District	44,272	43,132	43,132	
12th Naval District	23,001	17,956	17,956	
13th Naval District	11,073	6,915	6,915	
14th Naval District	15,694	14,349	15,694	
Marine Corps facilities	54,844	53,845	51,019	
Various locations (Trident)	118,320	112,320	112,320	
Air pollution abatement	27,636	27,636	27,636	
Water pollution abatement	60,680	51,112	51,112	
Total inside United States	580,180	507,560	516,626	
Outside United States:				
10th Naval District	2,852	2,852	14,852	
Atlantic area	17,478	17,478	11,386	
European area	8,192	10,050	10,050	
Pacific area	14,903	10,978	12,458	
Water pollution abatement	3,995	3,995	3,995	
Total outside United States	47,420	45,353	52,741	
General support programs:				
Minor construction	15,000	15,000	15,000	
Planning and design	53,000	53,800	57,800	
Access roads	1,000	1,000	2,000	
Total general authorization	69,800	69,800	74,800	
Grand total program	697,400	622,713	644,167	
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program	12,000	35,072	35,700	
Budget authority	685,400	587,641	608,467	

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
Inside United States:				
Aerospace Defense Command.....	8,794	8,863	8,863	-----
Air Force Communication Service.....	3,963	3,963	3,963	-----
Air Force Logistics Command.....	60,934	44,430	46,074	-----
Air Force Systems Command.....	9,062	8,120	8,582	-----
Air Training Command.....	56,282	54,089	54,089	-----
Air University.....	5,462	0	0	-----
Alaskan Air Command.....	8,658	8,658	8,658	-----
Headquarters Command.....	18,435	4,639	18,139	-----
Military Airlift Command.....	12,416	9,709	9,709	-----
Pacific Air Force.....	7,331	7,331	7,331	-----
Strategic Air Command.....	25,738	23,134	21,847	-----
Tactical Air Command.....	17,703	12,589	16,795	-----
USAF Academy.....	645	483	483	-----
USAF Security Service.....	0	6,115	6,115	-----
Air pollution abatement.....	3,689	3,689	3,689	-----
Water pollution abatement.....	5,381	5,381	5,381	-----
Classified locations.....	1,000	0	1,000	-----
Air installation compatible use zones.....	2,000	0	0	-----
Total inside United States.....	247,493	201,193	220,718	-----
Outside United States:				
Aerospace Defense Command.....	1,355	1,355	0	-----
Pacific Air Forces.....	11,788	7,940	7,950	-----
U.S. Air Force, Europe.....	15,925	17,102	17,102	-----
Southern command.....	1,038	927	927	-----
Security service.....	221	221	221	-----
Water pollution abatement.....	750	750	750	-----
Worldwide communications.....	330	330	330	-----
Total outside United States.....	31,407	28,635	27,280	-----
General support programs:				
Access roads.....	0	0	2,000	-----
Minor construction.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	-----
Planning.....	18,000	18,000	18,000	-----
Total general authorization.....	33,000	33,000	35,000	-----
Grant total program.....	311,900	262,828	282,998	-----
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program.....	20,000	23,126	21,800	-----
Budget authority.....	291,900	239,702	261,198	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF
DEFENSE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
Inside United States:				
National Security Agency.....	8, 156	4, 627	8, 156	-----
Defense Nuclear Agency.....	574	574	574	-----
Defense Supply Agency.....	8, 370	8, 370	8, 370	-----
Total, inside United States.....	17, 100	13, 571	17, 100	-----
Support programs:				
OSD Emergency Construction.....	30, 000	30, 000	30, 000	-----
Planning.....	1, 000	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Minor Construction.....	1, 000	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Total, general support programs.....	32, 000	32, 000	32, 000	-----
Grand total, program.....	49, 100	45, 571	49, 100	-----
Unobligated balance available to finance fiscal year 1974 program.....	30, 000	45, 571	37, 100	-----
Budget authority.....	19, 100	0	12, 000	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES				
Alabama:				
Army:				
Anniston Army Depot.....	3,745	3,745	3,745	-----
Fort McClellan.....	19,505	18,947	14,063	-----
Redstone Arsenal.....	4,971	4,971	4,971	-----
Fort Rucker.....	3,987	3,987	3,987	-----
Subtotal.....	32,208	31,650	26,766	-----
Air Force: Maxwell AFB, Montgomery.....	5,462	0	0	-----
Total	37,670	31,650	26,766	-----
Alaska:				
Army:				
Fort Greely.....	3,489	3,060	3,060	-----
Fort Richardson.....	2,140	2,140	2,140	-----
Fort Wainwright.....	2,715	2,715	2,715	-----
Subtotal.....	8,344	7,915	7,915	-----
Navy: Naval Complex, Adak.....	8,773	4,615	4,615	-----
Air Force:				
Cape Newenham AFS.....	5,403	5,403	5,403	-----
Eielson AFB, Fairbanks.....	1,557	1,557	1,557	-----
Indian Mountain, AFS.....	397	397	397	-----
Shemya AFB, Chichagof.....	956	956	956	-----
Sparrevohn AFS.....	345	345	345	-----
Subtotal.....	8,658	8,658	8,658	-----
Total	25,775	21,188	21,188	-----
Arizona:				
Army:				
Fort Huachuca.....	6,832	6,832	6,832	-----
Yuma Proving Ground.....	6,472	6,472	6,472	-----
Subtotal.....	13,304	13,304	13,304	-----
Navy: Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma.....	1,634	635	1,634	-----
Air Force:				
Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson.....	232	232	232	-----
Luke AFB, Phoenix.....	2,986	2,986	2,986	-----
Williams AFB, Maricopa.....	797	347	347	-----
Subtotal.....	4,015	3,565	3,565	-----
Total	18,953	17,504	18,503	-----
Arkansas:				
Army: Pine Bluff Arsenal.....	294	294	294	-----
Air Force:				
Blytheville AFB, Blytheville.....	140	0	0	-----
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock.....	1,165	1,165	1,165	-----
Subtotal.....	1,305	1,165	1,165	-----
Total	1,599	1,459	1,459	-----
California:				
Army:				
Fort McArthur.....	428	0	0	-----
Fort Ord.....	9,812	9,812	9,812	-----
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation.....	7,776	7,776	7,776	-----
Presidio of San Francisco.....	5,751	3,074	3,074	-----
Oakland Army Terminal.....	485	343	343	-----
Sacramento Army Depot.....	412	412	412	-----
Sierra Army Depot.....	380	380	380	-----
Subtotal.....	25,044	21,797	21,797	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
California—Continued				
Navy:				
Naval Weapons Center, China Lake.....	3,163	3,163	3,163	-----
Naval Hospital, Long Beach.....	878	878	878	-----
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach.....	6,808	6,808	6,808	-----
Naval Air Station, Miramar.....	1,873	1,454	1,454	-----
Naval Air Station, North Island.....	4,055	4,055	4,055	-----
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego.....	1,118	1,118	1,118	-----
Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego.....	3,518	3,518	3,518	-----
Naval Station, San Diego.....	11,996	11,996	11,996	-----
Naval Training Center, San Diego.....	2,944	2,944	2,944	-----
Navy Public Works Center, San Diego.....	2,471	2,471	2,471	-----
Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego.....	3,920	3,920	3,920	-----
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach.....	1,528	807	807	-----
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow.....	3,802	3,802	3,802	-----
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	10,920	10,920	10,920	-----
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro.....	747	747	747	-----
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego.....	3,825	3,825	0	-----
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms.....	2,992	2,992	2,992	-----
Naval Air Station, Alameda.....	5,236	3,727	3,827	-----
Naval Air Station, Lemoore.....	3,266	3,266	3,266	-----
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field.....	5,695	3,150	3,150	-----
Naval Hospital, Oakland.....	5,839	5,839	5,839	-----
Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island.....	641	0	0	-----
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo.....	2,074	1,874	1,874	-----
Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco.....	250	0	0	-----
Subtotal.....	89,559	83,374	79,549	-----
Air Force:				
Edwards AFB, Rosamond.....	889	889	889	-----
Mather, Sacramento.....	1,993	310	310	-----
McClellan AFB, Sacramento.....	3,171	2,572	2,572	-----
Norton AFB, San Bernardino.....	1,283	1,283	1,283	-----
Travis AFB, Fairfield.....	1,024	0	0	-----
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc.....	220	220	220	-----
Subtotal.....	8,580	5,274	5,274	-----
OSD: DSA-Defense Depot, Tracy Annex, Stockton.....	747	747	747	-----
Total.....	123,930	111,192	107,367	-----
Colorado:				
Army: Fort Carson.....				
	5,651	5,651	5,651	-----
Air Force:				
Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs.....	645	483	483	-----
Lowry AFB, Denver.....	21,610	20,350	20,350	-----
Peterson Field, Colorado Springs.....	7,843	7,843	7,843	-----
Subtotal.....	30,098	28,676	28,676	-----
Total.....	35,749	34,327	34,327	-----
Connecticut:				
Navy:				
Naval Submarine Base, New London.....	6,158	6,158	6,158	-----
Naval Underwater Systems Center Laboratory, New London.....	3,600	0	3,600	-----
Total.....	9,758	6,158	9,758	-----
Delaware: Air Force: Dover AFB, Dover (total).....	3,387	2,558	2,558	-----
District of Columbia:				
Army: Walter Reed Army Medical Center.....				
	12,827	13,535	13,535	-----
Navy: Naval Research Laboratory.....	5,395	4,655	4,655	-----
Air Force: Bolling AFB.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	-----
Total.....	19,722	19,690	19,690	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Florida:				
Army: Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	2,950	2,950	2,950	-----
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field.....	3,743	3,636	3,636	-----
Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field.....	75	75	75	-----
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.....	11,566	13,966	13,966	-----
Naval Hospital, Orlando.....	20,981	0	0	-----
Naval Training Center, Orlando.....	7,383	4,628	4,628	-----
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City..	5,649	5,649	5,649	-----
Naval Air Station, Pensacola.....	2,699	2,699	2,699	-----
Naval Communications Training Center, Pensa- cola.....	9,859	10,690	10,690	-----
Naval Air Station, Whiting Field.....	2,186	3,586	3,586	-----
Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola.....	1,084	1,084	1,084	-----
Subtotal.....	65,225	46,013	46,013	-----
Air Force:				
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	7,039	7,039	7,039	-----
MacDill AFB, Tampa.....	2,657	2,657	2,657	-----
Tyndall AFB, Springfield.....	951	1,020	1,020	-----
Subtotal.....	10,647	10,716	10,716	-----
Total.....	78,822	59,679	59,679	-----
Georgia:				
Army:				
Atlanta Army Depot.....	119	0	0	-----
Fort Benning.....	12,932	12,932	12,932	-----
Fort Gordon.....	23,780	20,230	23,154	-----
Fort McPherson.....	1,804	0	0	-----
Fort Stewart.....	264	264	264	-----
Subtotal.....	38,899	33,426	36,350	-----
Navy:				
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany.....	5,204	5,204	5,204	-----
NSCS, Athens.....	0	0	120	-----
Subtotal.....	5,204	5,204	5,324	-----
Air Force: Robins AFB, Warner Robins.....	4,868	4,628	4,628	-----
Total.....	48,971	43,258	46,302	-----
Hawaii:				
Army:				
Fort Shafter.....	1,233	0	1,233	-----
Schofield Barracks.....	9,592	9,592	9,592	-----
Subtotal.....	10,825	9,592	10,825	-----
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point.....	4,306	4,306	4,306	-----
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu.....	457	457	457	-----
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor.....	4,060	2,715	4,060	-----
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor.....	2,562	2,562	2,562	-----
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor.....	1,985	1,985	1,985	-----
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahi- awa.....	2,324	2,324	2,324	-----
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay.....	5,988	5,988	5,988	-----
Subtotal.....	21,682	20,337	21,682	-----
Air Force: Hickam AFB, Honolulu.....	7,331	7,331	7,331	-----
Total.....	39,838	37,260	39,838	-----
Idaho: Air Force: Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home (total).....	253	253	253	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Illinois:				
Army:				
Fort Sheridan	762	0	762	-----
Savanna Depot	2,746	0	0	-----
Subtotal	3,508	0	762	-----
Navy: Naval Complex, Great Lakes	19,908	15,148	15,148	-----
Air Force: Scott AFB, Shiloh	3,092	3,092	3,092	-----
OSD: DSA-Defense Contract Administration Regional Office, Chicago	404	404	404	-----
Total	26,912	18,644	19,406	-----
Indiana:				
Army: Fort Benjamin Harrison	3,893	3,893	3,893	-----
Air Force: Grissom AFB, Bunker Hill	3,100	1,500	0	-----
Total	6,993	5,393	3,893	-----
Kansas:				
Army: Fort Riley	34,918	30,943	30,943	-----
Air Force: McConnell AFB, Wichita	1,042	1,042	1,042	-----
Total	35,960	31,985	31,985	-----
Kentucky:				
Army:				
Fort Campbell	51,881	51,881	51,881	-----
Fort Knox	7,305	7,305	7,305	-----
Total	59,186	59,186	59,186	-----
Louisiana:				
Army: Fort Polk	29,276	27,299	29,276	-----
Navy:				
Naval Hospital, New Orleans	3,386	3,386	3,386	-----
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans	13,880	13,880	13,880	-----
Subtotal	17,266	17,266	17,266	-----
Air Force:				
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport	1,743	1,200	1,200	-----
England AFB, Alexandria	183	183	183	-----
Subtotal	1,926	1,383	1,383	-----
Total	48,468	45,948	47,925	-----
Maine:				
Navy:				
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery	2,817	2,817	2,817	-----
Naval Air Station, Brunswick	135	135	135	-----
Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor	232	0	0	-----
Total	3,184	2,952	2,952	-----
Maryland:				
Army:				
Aberdeen Proving Ground	11,934	7,472	7,472	-----
Fort George G. Meade	7,445	5,924	5,924	-----
Fort Ritchie	1,394	1,394	1,394	-----
Subtotal	20,773	14,790	14,790	-----
Navy:				
Naval Academy, Annapolis	4,334	4,034	4,334	-----
Naval Station, Annapolis	1,080	0	0	-----
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda	3,310	0	0	-----
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda	6,372	6,372	6,372	-----
Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham	1,300	0	0	-----
Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head	1,528	1,528	1,528	-----
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River	1,240	560	560	-----
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak	448	0	0	-----
Subtotal	19,612	12,494	12,794	-----
Air Force: Andrews AFB, Camp Springs	16,935	3,139	16,639	-----
OSD: NSA—Fort George G. Meade	8,156	4,627	8,156	-----
Total	65,476	35,050	48,850	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Massachusetts:				
Army:				
Army Metals and Mechanical Research Center.....	325	0	0	-----
Fort Devens.....	2,749	2,749	2,749	-----
Natick Laboratories.....	466	466	466	-----
Subtotal.....	3,540	3,215	3,215	-----
Air Force: Laurence G. Hanscom Field.....	480	0	0	-----
Total.....	4,020	3,215	3,215	-----
Michigan:				
Air Force:				
Kinchee AFB, Kinross.....	2,430	2,430	2,430	-----
Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda.....	616	616	616	-----
Subtotal.....	3,046	3,046	3,046	-----
OSD: DSA—Defense Logistic Services Center, Battle Creek.....	160	160	160	-----
Total.....	3,206	3,206	3,206	-----
Mississippi:				
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Meridian.....	5,125	5,125	5,125	-----
Naval Home, Gulfport.....	9,444	9,444	9,444	-----
Subtotal.....	14,569	14,569	14,569	-----
Air Force: Keesler AFB, Biloxi.....	8,786	9,986	9,986	-----
Total.....	23,355	24,555	24,555	-----
Missouri:				
Army: Fort Leonard Wood.....	44,482	44,482	44,482	-----
Air Force:				
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Grandview.....	3,963	3,963	3,963	-----
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster.....	3,892	3,892	3,892	-----
Subtotal.....	7,855	7,855	7,855	-----
Total.....	52,337	52,337	52,337	-----
Montana: Air Force: Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls (total).....	1,507	1,507	1,720	-----
Nebraska:				
Air Force: Offutt, AFB, Omaha.....	617	617	617	-----
Total.....	617	617	617	-----
Nevada:				
Air Force: Nellis AFB, Las Vegas.....	2,588	655	2,588	-----
OSD: DNA—Atomic Energy Commission Test Site.....	200	200	200	-----
Total.....	2,788	855	2,788	-----
New Hampshire:				
Army: Cold Regions Laboratories.....	597	0	597	-----
Air Force: Pease AFB, Portsmouth.....	526	526	526	-----
Total.....	1,123	526	1,123	-----
New Jersey:				
Army:				
Fort Dix.....	339	0	0	-----
Fort Monmouth.....	12,286	8,401	8,401	-----
Bayonne Mil Ocean Terminal.....	3,603	0	2,200	-----
Piscataway Arsenal.....	2,915	255	255	-----
Subtotal.....	19,143	8,656	10,856	-----
Navy: Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne.....	1,806	0	1,806	-----
Air Force: McGuire AFB, Wrightstown.....	1,860	1,698	1,698	-----
Total.....	22,809	10,354	14,360	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
New Mexico:				
Army: White Sands Missile Range.....	4, 771	3, 843	3, 843	-----
Air Force:				
Cannon AFB, Clovis.....	162	162	162	-----
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo.....	2, 432	1, 524	1, 524	-----
Subtotal.....	2, 594	1, 686	1, 686	-----
OSD: DNA—Kirtland AFB.....	374	374	374	-----
Total.....	7, 739	5, 903	5, 903	-----
New York:				
Army:				
Camp Drum.....	1, 099	1, 099	1, 099	-----
U.S. Military Academy.....	30, 145	5, 145	25, 145	-----
Subtotal.....	31, 244	6, 244	26, 244	-----
Navy: Naval Support Activity, New York.....	1, 131	0	0	-----
Air Force: Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh.....	286	286	286	-----
Total.....	32, 661	6, 530	26, 530	-----
North Carolina:				
Army:				
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal.....	1, 628	1, 628	1, 628	-----
Fort Bragg.....	33, 471	32, 400	32, 400	-----
Subtotal.....	35, 099	34, 028	34, 028	-----
Navy:				
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune.....	8, 902	8, 902	8, 902	-----
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point.....	1, 821	1, 821	1, 821	-----
Marine Corps Air Station, New River.....	3, 245	3, 245	3, 245	-----
Subtotal.....	13, 968	13, 968	13, 968	-----
Total.....	49, 067	47, 996	47, 996	-----
Ohio:				
Air Force: Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton.....	19, 551	11, 390	13, 277	-----
OSD: DSA—Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus.....	1, 188	1, 188	1, 188	-----
Total.....	20, 739	12, 578	14, 465	-----
Oklahoma:				
Army: Fort Sill.....	9, 447	9, 447	9, 447	-----
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester.....	2, 442	2, 442	2, 442	-----
Air Force:				
Altus AFB, Altus.....	1, 770	1, 078	1, 078	-----
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City.....	15, 275	11, 396	11, 153	-----
Vance AFB, Enid.....	371	371	371	-----
Subtotal.....	17, 416	12, 845	12, 602	-----
Total.....	27, 305	24, 734	24, 491	-----
Pennsylvania:				
Army:				
Tobyhanna Army Depot.....	0	0	456	-----
Carlisle Barracks.....	2, 465	0	0	-----
Frankford Arsenal.....	73	0	0	-----
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation.....	1, 657	1, 657	1, 657	-----
Subtotal.....	4, 195	1, 657	2, 113	-----
Navy:				
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia.....	915	180	180	-----
Naval Air Development Center, Warminster.....	215	0	0	-----
Subtotal.....	1, 130	180	180	-----
OSD:				
DSA—Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg.....	2, 048	2, 048	2, 048	-----
Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia.....	560	560	560	-----
Subtotal.....	2, 608	2, 608	2, 608	-----
Total.....	7, 933	4, 445	4, 901	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
South Carolina:				
Army: Fort Jackson	2,902	2,902	2,902	-----
Navy:				
Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston	252	252	252	-----
Naval Station, Charleston	1,498	177	1,498	-----
Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort	126	126	126	-----
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island	2,580	2,580	2,580	-----
Subtotal	4,456	3,135	4,456	-----
Air Force: Shaw AFB, Sumter	2,501	2,501	2,501	-----
Total	9,859	8,538	9,859	-----
South Dakota: Air Force: Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City (total)	514	514	514	-----
Tennessee:				
Army: Defense Depot, Memphis	456	0	0	-----
Navy: Naval Air Station, Memphis	4,478	4,478	4,478	-----
OSD: DSA—Defense Depot, Memphis	360	360	360	-----
Total	5,294	4,838	4,838	-----
Texas:				
Army:				
Aeronautical Maintenance Center	6,284	6,284	6,284	-----
Fort Bliss	6,087	6,087	6,087	-----
Fort Hood	15,094	9,824	9,824	-----
Fort Sam Houston	11,738	11,738	11,738	-----
Subtotal	39,203	33,933	33,933	-----
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Chase Field	2,875	2,875	2,875	-----
Naval Air Station, Kingsville	3,040	3,040	3,040	-----
Subtotal	5,915	5,915	5,915	-----
Air Force:				
Bergstrom AFB, Austin	2,273	0	2,273	-----
Dyess AFB, Abilene	730	730	730	-----
Goodfellow AFB		6,115	6,115	-----
Kelly AFB, San Antonio	6,101	6,101	6,101	-----
Lackland AFB, San Antonio	6,509	6,509	6,509	-----
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio	4,635	4,635	4,635	-----
Randolph AFB, San Antonio	1,463	1,463	1,463	-----
Reese AFB, Lubbock	4,211	4,211	4,211	-----
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls	2,753	2,753	2,753	-----
Webb AFB, Big Spring	3,154	3,514	3,154	-----
Subtotal	31,829	35,671	37,944	-----
Total	76,947	75,519	77,792	-----
Utah:				
Air Force: Hill AFB, Ogden	11,968	8,343	8,343	-----
OSD: DSA—Defense Depot, Ogden	250	250	250	-----
Total	12,218	8,593	8,593	-----
Virginia:				
Army:				
Camp A. P. Hill	535	535	535	-----
Camp Pickett	476	476	476	-----
Fort Eustis	4,782	4,782	4,782	-----
Fort Belvoir	14,403	897	897	-----
Fort Lee	22,769	18,326	18,326	-----
Fort Monroe	867	0	0	-----
Vinhill Farms	287	0	0	-----
Subtotal	44,119	25,016	25,016	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Virginia—Continued				
Navy:				
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren	249	249	249	
Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck	6,531	6,531	6,531	
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	3,350	3,211	3,211	
Naval Air Station, Norfolk	2,525	2,525	2,525	
Naval Station, Norfolk	18,493	18,183	21,583	
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk	567	567	567	
Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk	2,470	0	0	
Naval Air Station, Oceana	3,962	3,386	3,386	
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	11,133	11,133	11,133	
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown	1,327	1,327	1,327	
Naval Hospital, Quantico	484	484	484	
Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico	831	831	831	
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico	1,541	1,541	1,541	
Fleet Marine Force Atlantic, Norfolk	686	686	686	
Subtotal	54,149	50,654	54,054	
Air Force: Langley AFB, Hampton	503	503	503	
OSD: DSA—Defense General Supply Center, Richmond	2,653	2,653	2,653	
Total	101,424	78,826	82,226	
Washington:				
Army: Fort Lewis	8,327	8,327	8,327	
Navy: Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton	2,300	2,300	2,300	
Total	10,627	10,627	10,627	
Wyoming: Air Force: Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne (total)				
	5,834	5,834	5,834	
Various locations:				
Army:				
Air pollution abatement	7,295	6,900	7,295	
Water pollution abatement	7,099	7,099	7,099	
Subtotal	14,394	13,999	14,394	
Navy:				
TRIDENT facilities	118,320	112,320	112,320	
Air pollution abatement	27,636	27,636	27,636	
Water pollution abatement	60,680	51,112	51,112	
Subtotal	206,636	191,068	191,068	
Air Force:				
Air Installation Compatible Use Zones	2,000	0	0	
Air pollution abatement	3,689	3,689	3,689	
Water pollution abatement	5,381	5,381	5,381	
Satellite control facilities	654	192	654	
Strategic Air Command-various	1,321	1,000	1,000	
SRAM	988	988	988	
Subtotal	14,033	11,250	11,712	
Total	235,063	216,317	217,174	
Total inside United States (excluding classified projects):				
Army	563,819	471,974	497,634	
Navy	580,180	507,560	516,626	
Air Force	246,493	201,193	219,718	
OSD	17,100	13,571	17,100	
Total	1,407,592	1,194,298	1,251,078	
OUTSIDE UNITED STATES				
Australia: Navy: Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth (total)	1,912	1,192	1,192	
Bermuda: Navy: Naval Air Station, Bermuda (total)	3,010	3,010	3,010	

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
OUTSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Canal Zone:				
Army: Panama Area	8,095	8,095	8,095	-----
Air Force: Howard AFB	1,038	927	927	-----
Total	9,133	9,022	9,022	-----
Cuba: Navy: Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay (total)	8,376	8,376	8,376	-----
Germany:				
Army: Various locations	12,517	13,124	13,124	-----
Air Force:				
Bitburg AB, Bitburg	3,936	3,936	3,936	-----
Ramstein AB, Landstuhl	465	0	0	-----
Sembach AB, Sembach	1,245	1,245	1,245	-----
Various locations	0	7,333	7,333	-----
Subtotal	5,646	12,514	12,514	-----
Total	18,163	25,638	25,638	-----
Greece:				
Navy:				
Naval Support Office, Athens	0	1,948	1,948	-----
Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete	4,153	4,153	4,153	-----
Subtotal	4,153	6,101	6,101	-----
Air Force: Iraklion AS	221	221	221	-----
Total	4,374	6,322	6,322	-----
Guam MI: Navy: Naval Complex, Guam (total)	10,988	9,508	10,988	-----
Iceland:				
Navy: Naval Station, Keflavik	6,092	6,092	0	-----
Air Force: Naval Station, Keflavik	1,355	1,355	0	-----
Total	7,447	7,447		-----
Italy: Navy: Naval Air Facility, Sigonella (total)	3,086	3,086	3,086	-----
Japan: Air Force: Misawa AB (total)	417	417	417	-----
Korea:				
Army: Various locations	1,568	1,568	1,568	-----
Air Force:				
Osan AB, Song Tan	4,162	4,162	4,162	-----
Kunsan AB	1,838	0	0	-----
Various locations	944	944	944	-----
Subtotal	6,944	5,106	5,106	-----
Total	8,512	6,674	6,674	-----
Kwajalein Island:				
Army: National Missile Range (total)	2,353	1,029	1,029	-----
Philippines:				
Navy: Naval Complex, Subic Bay	2,723	278	278	-----
Air Force: Clark AB, Angeles	4,427	2,427	2,427	-----
Total	7,150	2,705	2,705	-----
Puerto Rico:				
Army: Fort Buchanan	517	517	517	-----
Navy:				
Culebra, P.R.	0	0	12,000	-----
Naval Complex, Puerto Rico	1,707	1,707	1,707	-----
Subtotal	1,707	1,707	13,707	-----
Total	2,224	2,224	14,224	-----
Scotland: Navy: Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell (total)	868	778	778	-----
Spain: Navy: Naval Station, Rota (total)	85	85	85	-----
Turkey: Air Force: Incirlik AS, Incirlik (total)	800	800	800	-----

FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State/Service	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
OUTSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
United Kingdom:				
Air Force:				
RAF, Mildenhall.....	768	768	768	-----
RAF, Upper Heyford.....	8,711	3,020	3,020	-----
Total.....	9,479	3,788	3,788	-----
West Indies: Navy: Naval Facility, Grand Turk (total)....	1,145	1,145	1,145	-----
Various locations:				
Army:				
USAREUR, infrastructure.....	185,300	295,650	75,650	-----
Army Security Agency.....	1,434	6,454	1,434	-----
Stratcom.....	2,097	2,334	2,334	-----
Subtotal.....	188,831	299,418	79,418	-----
Navy: Water pollution abatement.....	3,995	3,995	3,995	-----
Air Force:				
Water pollution abatement.....	750	750	750	-----
Technical control facilities.....	330	330	330	-----
Subtotal.....	1,080	1,080	1,080	-----
Total.....	193,906	2104,493	84,493	-----
Total outside United States (excluding classified projects):				
Army.....	1113,881	2123,751	103,751	-----
Navy.....	47,420	45,353	52,741	-----
Air Force.....	31,437	28,635	27,280	-----
Total.....	1192,708	2197,739	183,772	-----
Classified (inside United States): (Total)				
Army: Various.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	-----
Air Force: Classified locations—Radar support facilities.....	1,000	0	1,000	-----
Total.....	4,000	3,000	4,000	-----
Planning:				
Army.....	39,000	39,000	39,000	-----
Navy:				
Trident.....	10,800	10,800	10,800	-----
Other.....	43,000	47,000	47,000	-----
Subtotal.....	53,800	57,800	57,800	-----
Air Force.....	18,000	18,000	18,000	-----
OSD.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	-----
Total.....	111,800	115,800	115,800	-----
Minor construction:				
Army.....	12,500	15,000	15,000	-----
Navy.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	-----
Air Force.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	-----
OSD.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	-----
Total.....	43,500	46,800	46,000	-----
Access roads:				
Army.....	0	0	2,000	-----
Navy.....	1,000	1,000	2,000	-----
Air Force.....	0	0	2,000	-----
Total.....	1,000	1,000	6,000	-----
Emergency construction: OSD (total).....	30,000	30,000	30,000	-----

¹ Reflect budget amendment of Sept. 21, 1973 for NATO infrastructure, increasing total obligational authority by \$25,300,000 and budget authority by \$4,300,000.

² Reflects \$35,650,000 unobligated safeguard fund approved in HAC report for transfer to NATO infrastructure.

**FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AIR POLLUTION
ABATEMENT PROGRAM**

[In thousands of dollars]

State/service and installation	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES				
Alabama: Air Force: Maxwell AFB, Montgomery, total	115	115	115	
Alaska:				
Army: Fort Wainwright	3,227	3,227	3,227	
Air Force: Eielson AFB	2,600	2,600	2,600	
Total	5,827	5,827	5,827	
California: Navy:				
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	4,152	4,152	4,152	
Naval Air Station, North Island	227	227	227	
Navy Public Works, Center, San Diego	684	684	684	
Naval Supply Center, Oakland	300	300	300	
Marine Corps Naval Shipyard, Vallejo	6,121	6,121	6,121	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	365	365	365	
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	1,698	1,698	1,698	
Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana	344	344	344	
Total	13,891	13,891	13,891	
Colorado: Army: Pueblo Army Depot, total	395	0	395	
Florida: Air Force: Lynn Haven Retail Distribution Station, Lynn Haven, total	532	532	532	
Hawaii:				
Navy: Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor	1,302	1,302	1,302	
Air Force: Hickam AFB, Honolulu	225	225	225	
Total	1,527	1,527	1,527	
Louisiana: Army: Fort Polk, total	350	350	350	
Nevada: Air Force: Nellis AFB, Las Vegas, total	98	98	98	
New Jersey: Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, total	170	170	170	
North Dakota: Air Force: Minot AFB, Minot, total	119	119	119	
Pennsylvania: Navy: Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, total	1,539	1,539	1,539	
South Carolina: Navy: Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, total	351	351	351	
Tennessee: Army: Holston AAP, total	730	730	730	
Texas: Army: Longhorn AAP, total	800	800	800	
Virginia:				
Navy:				
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	3,621	3,621	3,621	
Marine Corps Development Education Com- mand, Quantico	750	750	750	
Subtotal	4,371	4,371	4,371	
Army: Radford AAP	730	730	730	
Total	5,101	5,101	5,101	
Washington: Navy: Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, total	6,012	6,012	6,012	
Various locations: Army: Various, total	1,063	1,063	1,063	
Total inside United States:				
Army	7,295	6,900	7,295	
Navy	27,636	27,636	27,636	
Air Force	3,689	3,689	3,689	
Total	38,620	38,225	38,620	

**FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, WATER POLLUTION
ABATEMENT PROGRAM**

[In thousands of dollars]

State/service and installation	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
Alaska: Army: Fort Richardson, total.....	300	300	300	-----
Alabama: Army: Anniston Army Depot, total.....	2, 229	2, 229	2, 229	-----
Arkansas: Air Force: Blytheville AFB, Blytheville, total.....	276	276	276	-----
California:				
Navy:				
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach.....	3, 242	3, 242	3, 242	-----
Naval Supply Center, San Diego.....	113	113	113	-----
Naval Station, San Diego.....	5, 945	5, 945	5, 945	-----
Naval Air Station, Alameda.....	527	527	527	-----
Naval Supply Center, Oakland.....	578	578	578	-----
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo.....	3, 700	0	0	-----
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	542	542	542	-----
Subtotal.....	14, 647	10, 947	10, 947	-----
Air Force: Beale AFB, Marysville.....	1, 978	1, 978	1, 978	-----
Total.....	16, 625	12, 925	12, 925	-----
Connecticut: Navy: Naval Submarine Base, New London, total.....	1, 524	1, 524	1, 524	-----
District of Columbia: Navy: Commandant, Naval Dis- trict, Washington, total.....	444	444	444	-----
Florida:				
Navy:				
Naval Fuel Depot, Jacksonville.....	4, 095	4, 095	4, 095	-----
Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola.....	228	228	228	-----
Subtotal.....	4, 323	4, 323	4, 323	-----
Air Force: Eglin AFB, Valparaiso.....	859	859	859	-----
Total.....	5, 182	5, 182	5, 182	-----
Georgia:				
Army: Military Ocean Terminal, Kings Bay.....	175	175	175	-----
Navy: Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany.....	449	449	449	-----
Air Force: Robins AFB, Warner Robins.....	364	364	364	-----
Total.....	998	988	988	-----
Hawaii:				
Navy:				
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point.....	6, 368	500	500	-----
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu.....	351	351	351	-----
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor.....	6, 389	6, 389	6, 389	-----
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor.....	453	453	453	-----
Subtotal.....	13, 561	7, 693	7, 693	-----
Air Force: Wheeler AFB, Oahu.....	280	280	280	-----
Total.....	13, 841	7, 973	7, 973	-----
Indiana: Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, total.....	972	972	972	-----
Kansas: Army: Fort Leavenworth, total.....	178	178	178	-----
Louisiana: Army: Fort Polk, total.....	717	717	717	-----
Maine: Air Force: Charleston AFS, Charleston, total.....	136	136	136	-----
Maryland: Air Force: Andrews AFB, Camp Springs, total.....	304	304	304	-----
Michigan: Air Force: K. I. Sawyer AFB, Marquette, total.....	229	229	229	-----
Mississippi: Navy: Naval Air Station, Meridian, total.....	276	276	276	-----
Nebraska: Air Force: Offutt AFB, Omaha, total.....	82	82	82	-----
Nevada: Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, total.....	4, 955	4, 955	4, 955	-----
New Hampshire: Air Force: Pease AFB, Portsmouth, total.....	197	197	197	-----
North Carolina: Navy: Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, total.....	1, 198	1, 198	1, 198	-----
Rhode Island: Navy: Navy Public Works Center, New- port, total.....	425	425	425	-----

**FISCAL YEAR 1974 APPROPRIATION REQUEST—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION WATER POLLUTION
ABATEMENT PROGRAM—Continued**

[In thousands of dollars]

State/service and installation	DOD request	House action	Senate action	Conference report
INSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued				
South Carolina:				
Navy:				
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....	116	116	116	-----
Naval Supply Center, Charleston.....	331	331	331	-----
Subtotal.....	447	447	447	-----
Air Force: Myrtle Beach AFB, Myrtle Beach.....	417	417	417	-----
Total.....	864	864	864	-----
Tennessee: Navy: Naval Air Station, Memphis, total.....	107	107	107	-----
Texas: Air Force: Kelly AFB, San Antonio, total.....	66	66	66	-----
Virginia: Navy:				
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren.....	221	221	221	-----
Fleet Combat Direction System Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck.....	600	600	600	-----
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek.....	433	433	433	-----
Naval Air Station, Norfolk.....	268	268	268	-----
Naval Communication Station, Norfolk.....	620	620	620	-----
Naval Station, Norfolk.....	1,977	1,977	1,977	-----
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk.....	1,777	1,777	1,777	-----
Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk.....	325	325	325	-----
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth.....	3,114	3,114	3,114	-----
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico.....	2,088	2,088	2,088	-----
Total.....	11,423	11,423	11,423	-----
Washington:				
Navy:				
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton.....	5,291	5,291	5,291	-----
Naval Supply Center, Bremerton.....	204	204	204	-----
Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport.....	434	434	434	-----
Subtotal.....	5,929	5,929	5,929	-----
Air Force: Fairchild AFB, Spokane.....	193	193	193	-----
Total.....	6,122	6,122	6,122	-----
Various locations: Army: Various, total.....	3,500	3,500	3,500	-----
Total inside United States:				
Army.....	7,099	7,099	7,099	-----
Navy.....	60,680	51,112	51,112	-----
Air Force.....	5,381	5,381	5,381	-----
Total.....	73,160	63,592	63,592	-----
OUTSIDE UNITED STATES				
Guam: Navy: Naval Complex, Guam, total.....	3,237	3,237	3,237	-----
Philippines: Air Force: Clark AFB, total.....	400	400	400	-----
Phoenix Islands: Air Force: Canton Island, total.....	350	350	350	-----
Puerto Rico: Navy: Naval Complex, Puerto Rico, total.....	758	758	758	-----
Total outside United States:				
Navy.....	3,995	3,995	3,995	-----
Air Force.....	750	750	750	-----
Total.....	4,745	4,745	4,745	-----

Summary of the military family housing new construction approved

State, service, and installation:

	Number of whites
Arkansas:	
Air Force: Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville-----	100
California:	
Navy:	
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton-----	800
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms-----	200
Naval complex, San Diego-----	325
Colorado:	
Army: Fort Carson, Colorado Springs-----	200
Florida:	
Army: Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso-----	25
Navy: Naval complex, Jacksonville-----	400
Air Force:	
Avon Park Weapons Range-----	50
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso-----	250
Hawaii:	
Army: U.S. Army installations, Oahu-----	600
Navy: Naval complex, Oahu-----	400
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Oahu-----	400
Kansas:	
Army: Fort Riley-----	901
Kentucky:	
Army: Fort Campbell-----	1, 000
Louisiana:	
Army: Fort Polk, Leesville-----	500
Navy: Naval complex, New Orleans-----	100
Maryland:	
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	300
Mississippi:	
Navy:	
Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport-----	100
Naval Home, Gulfport-----	5
North Carolina:	
Army: Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville-----	136
North Dakota:	
Air Force: Grand Forks Air Force Base-----	100
Pennsylvania:	
Army: Tobyhanna Army Depot-----	86
Navy: Naval complex, South Philadelphia-----	350
South Carolina:	
Navy: Naval complex, Charleston-----	270
Texas:	
Army:	
Fort Hood, Killeen-----	900
Red River Army Depot-----	21
Air Force: Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls-----	200
Virginia:	
Army:	
Fort Belvoir-----	700
Fort Eustis-----	300
Australia:	
DIA: Defense Attaché Office, Canberra-----	5
Marianas Islands:	
Navy: Naval complex, Guam-----	510
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base, Guam-----	300
Netherlands:	
DIA: Defeyse Attaché Office, The Hague-----	4
Peru:	
DIA: Defense Attaché Office, Lima-----	3

10, 541

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1974

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, 1973 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1974 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (—) (4)
Family housing, Defense, Homeowners assistance fund, authorization to spend debt receipts (permanent, indefinite).....	—0—	\$17, 443, 000	+\$17, 443, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

[In dollars]

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority, recommended in the House Bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Senate committee bill compared with—		
					New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Military construction, Army.....	413,955,000	¹ 664,900,000	551,575,000	567,735,000	+153,780,000	-97,165,000	+16,160,000
Military construction, Navy.....	517,830,000	685,400,000	587,641,000	608,467,000	+90,637,000	-76,933,000	+20,826,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	265,552,000	291,900,000	239,702,000	261,198,000	-4,354,000	-30,702,000	+21,496,000
Military construction, Defense agencies.....	38,704,000	19,100,000	0	12,030,000	-24,704,000	-7,100,000	+12,000,000
<i>Transfer, not to exceed</i>	<i>(20,000,000)</i>	<i>(20,000,000)</i>	<i>(20,000,000)</i>	<i>(20,000,000)</i>	-----	-----	-----
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	40,000,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	-4,800,000	-----	-----
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	16,100,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+3,900,000	-----	-----
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	38,200,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	+2,500,000	-----	-----
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	20,500,000	20,300,000	22,900,000	20,300,000	-200,000	-----	-2,600,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+3,000,000	-----	-----
Total military construction.....	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	1,507,718,000	1,575,600,000	+219,759,000	-211,900,000	+67,882,000
Family housing defense.....	1,064,046,000	² 1,250,567,000	1,194,539,000	1,188,539,000	+124,493,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000
Portion applied to debt reduction.....	-96,666,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-3,501,000	-----	-----
Subtotal, family housing.....	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	1,094,372,000	1,088,372,000	+120,992,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000
Homeowners assistance fund, Defense.....	-----	³ 7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	-----	-----
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,323,221,000	2,944,900,000	2,609,090,000	2,670,972,000	+347,751,000	-273,928,000	+61,882,000

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

² Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

³ Includes \$7,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155